

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MRS. STEVE TULLER, HERNDON, VA.,
MILITARY WIFE OF THE YEAR

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I am pleased to report to Congress and the American public on the selection of the Military Wife of the Year, Mrs. Steve Tuller of Herndon, Va.

We are all aware of the many thousands of military wives who devote untold energies to civic and humanitarian programs while at the same time maintaining their homes and keeping the letters flowing to their husbands. They contribute much to maintaining the excellent morale of our Armed Forces, and all Americans owe them a great debt.

The annual award to the Military Wife of the Year was conceived by Art Linkletter and Wilson Harrell, president of Harrell International, Inc., and sponsored by Alfred J. Stokely, president of Stokely-Van Camp, Inc. The program, originally designed to bring entertainment to the wives and dependents of active-duty military personnel, was expanded to focus attention on the remarkable work military wives are doing to better community relations between the military and civilian population.

All women's clubs whose memberships are wives of active-duty Armed Forces personnel throughout the world are invited to submit nominations. Through a selection process, the field is then narrowed to five—one representative of each of the five major military branches of the service.

The final judging is done by a panel of distinguished women at a formal dinner in Washington, D.C.

On the evening of May 16, 1972, the panel of judges selected Mrs. Tuller as the Military Wife of the Year 1972.

The Washington Star of May 17 contains an interesting account of the award ceremony, including a report of Mrs. Tuller's many activities and accomplishments.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AREA WOMAN NAMED MILITARY WIFE OF THE YEAR

(By Ruth Dean)

An area Coast Guard wife who takes retarded children and teen-agers fighting drug problems into her home was named Military Wife of the Year last night.

Mrs. Dorothy Ann Tuller, wife of Chief Warrant Officer Steve Tuller, was so overwhelmed when Deputy Secretary of Defense Kenneth Rush announced her name, she had to fight back tears.

And the standing ovation and cheers she got from a Shoreham Hotel banquet audience of Pentagon brass and members of Congress revealed that she was their choice long before the judges' decision concurred.

The pretty brown-haired Coast Guard Wife of the Year held a spray of red roses as head-table guests gave her congratulatory hugs. And in the excitement, the weight of the huge trophy almost threw its giver, Alfred J. Stokely, president of Stokely-Van Camp, to the floor at the podium.

TROPHY RESCUED

But Stokely and the trophy were rescued by Mrs. Tuller's husband, a husky 6-footer who is stationed at the Naval School of Health Care Administration at Bethesda, and shares in his wife's dedicated efforts to help troubled teen-agers.

In the final competition interview with emcee Art Linkletter, it was obvious that the veteran showman was touched by Mrs. Tuller's accomplishments, as he himself has been in the forefront of fighting the drug problem as the result of personal family tragedy.

Though childless, the Tullers have befriended many children whose fathers were serving in Vietnam or who were abandoned by parents who couldn't cope with the drug problem.

"The drug abuse problem and learning disability, are often related," Mrs. Tuller told Linkletter. "But for this type commitment you have to be available. That's why we live right in the center of a school district."

In introducing Mrs. Tuller, Linkletter also revealed she is a licensed pilot and Powder-puff Derby contestant as well as Civil Air Patrol volunteer, bathing suit designer, photographer and ham radio operator.

In congratulating her, he said, "I'm glad you have 16 airplanes to fly because you'll be going off in all directions" to visit military installations all over the United States in the new role.

FIVE FINALISTS

Mrs. Tuller succeeds Mrs. Jeannette M. Squires, wife of Navy Personnelman 1/C James M. Squires, who won the title last year.

Mrs. Tuller was one of five finalists from the five military services, each of whom was given a "Mill" award.

They were chosen from thousands of entrants in the contest annually sponsored as a public service by Stokely-Van Camp in cooperation with the Defense Department, and produced by Harrell International, a worldwide military marketing company.

Guests included Secretary of Labor James D. Hodgson, whose wife was one of the judges selected by the General Federation of Women's Clubs. Other judges were Mrs. William D. Ruckelshaus, Mrs. Elizabeth Carpenter, Mrs. Edward L. R. Elson and Mrs. Gwendolyn Cafritz.

FOR PROGRESS IN SPACE—AMERICA INDEBTED TO DR. VON BRAUN

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Nashville Banner in a recent editorial praised and applauded the great work of Dr. Wernher von Braun as a leader in space exploration by the United States on the occasion of Dr. von Braun's retirement from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to enter private industry.

Certainly I wholeheartedly concur in the sentiments expressed in the Banner

editorial—Dr. von Braun is an outstanding scientist and a great American. He was captain of the successful space team that put 10 men on the moon—our American space pioneers.

Dr. von Braun appeared before my Subcommittee on Appropriations many times as an official of NASA and I recall that at the inception of the space program I asked him if he were confident that a man could be placed on the moon and returned safely to earth. He replied with confidence that he was certain that this could be done, precisely and safely.

Again, 5 years later, just prior to the first landing on the moon, I again propounded this question to Dr. von Braun. He again replied that he was still confident of the success of the mission—"well, yes," he said, "if the money holds out."

Funds to finance the moon missions were appropriated and—as we all know—the program has been successful. America was behind in space when Dr. von Braun entered the space program at NASA—under his scientific guidance America moved ahead in the space program and excelled Russia during the first decade of space exploration.

The first phase is ending and we are now embarking on the second phase. As Dr. von Braun leaves NASA he deserves the plaudits, congratulations and appreciation of the American people for a job well done. His cherished boyhood dream of a voyage to the moon came true—and he made it come true. America owes him a debt of gratitude.

I commend him and wish him well as he enters private industry—Dr. von Braun is one of the great space pioneers of this century and of history.

The editorial follows:

FOR PROGRESS IN SPACE—AMERICA INDEBTED TO DR. VON BRAUN

Because there was—and is—a Dr. Wernher von Braun among those in the United States, who dreamed and worked and built in the pattern of space science, fellow-American associates on the NASA team has walked on the moon. It is a commonly acknowledged fact; for in the several capacities he has served, as in the decade of his directorship of the Marshall Space Flight Center at Huntsville, his vision and energy, his knowledge in that area of science, were notable factors in the over-all accomplishment.

In the Huntsville assignment he headed the team that developed the world's most powerful rocket, the Saturn V, which propelled Apollo's lunar missions.

Now Dr. Von Braun has retired from NASA to enter private industry, but with the comforting knowledge that the agency's future is reasonably assured. It is particularly gratifying that his new connection is related to the aerospace field.

America was fortunate that this German-born rocket expert elected to come to this country after the war—that by his very nature he preferred a nation and climate of freedom, and that his capabilities have been used not only to advance the science of rocketry for space exploration—inter-planetary travel—but for peace and security.

Not always, but sometimes, there is greater appreciation of and for America on the part of some newly-privileged to be a part of it

than felt by some who have known the privilege for a lifetime.

Almost a score of years ago, Dr. Von Braun received his citizenship. In connection with the naturalization ceremony he spoke words that warrant engraving on the nation's heart:

"I am proud to be a citizen of the United States of America. I must say that we all became Americans in our hearts long ago. I have never regretted the decision to come to this country. As time goes by, I can see even more clearly that it was a moral decision we made that day at Peenemunde. Somehow we sensed that the secret of rocketry should get only into the hands of people who read the Bible." His words were like apples of gold in pictures of silver.

The United States of America reciprocates the affection and faith he expressed. In or out of NASA, he still is on the working end of science in the national interest and humanity's.

NUCLEAR SAFETY IS QUESTIONED IN READER'S DIGEST

HON. MIKE GRAVEL

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, thanks to the June 1972 issue of the Reader's Digest, a very large group of voters may have learned that they are guinea pigs in a morally grotesque nuclear-power experiment which is permitted by Congress.

An article entitled "Just How Safe Is a Nuclear Power Plant?" explains one important reason why Congress will have to consider a moratorium on the operation of nuclear powerplants. There are several additional reasons which are necessarily omitted from such a brief article.

The author, who is one of the Digest's own roving editors, urges the public to insist on nuclear safety before more nuclear powerplants are built and licensed. He refers to the nuclear power moratorium bill, S. 3223, which I introduced on February 23, 1972.

ANOTHER SENATOR MOVES FOR A MORATORIUM

I am pleased to learn from friends in Pennsylvania that I am no longer the only Member of the Senate who favors a moratorium. On April 12, 1972, Senator SCHWEIKER wrote to a concerned group in Tunkhannock, Pa., as follows:

I have recently called for a moratorium on the operation of nuclear power plants until the underlying questions concerning possible radiation effects and environmental pollution are satisfactorily answered.

As I noted in my Senate remarks on May 24—page 18815—I expect many other Senators to move into the moratorium position soon.

No one has to choose between nuclear electricity or blackouts.

Energy experts agree that our abundant coal can be converted into a clean and desirable fuel with a minimum of time, effort, and expense. Even General Electric and Westinghouse, who are the two biggest manufacturers of nuclear power systems, have joined the business of gasifying coal. Congress will have to require, however, satisfactory restoration of strip mined land.

THE EDESEL OF THE ENERGY INDUSTRY

Clean coal technology is not our only alternative to nuclear fission.

We can produce electricity from geothermal hot water, from windmills pulling their energy out of the sky and converting it to hydrogen, from methane produced on algae-farms, from sea-thermal gradients, and from direct sunlight.

Every available alternative is intrinsically more attractive than nuclear fission.

Fission may just be the Edsel of the energy industry.

ARTICLE PLACED IN THE RECORD

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Just How Safe Is a Nuclear Power Plant?" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Readers' Digest, June 1972]
JUST HOW SAFE IS A NUCLEAR POWER PLANT?
(By James Nathan Miller)

(The nation is at the point of committing itself to the atom. But some people—scientists included—are having deep second thoughts.)

In recent months, a debate most of us had considered settled has been revived: How safe are nuclear power plants?

For the last decade, concerned-citizen groups have been loudly bemoaning the building of such plants, arguing that we are setting ourselves up for some kind of holocaust. But much of this protest has come from people who tend to swoon at the mere mention of the word "atomic," and the bulk of scientific testimony has held that the plants are safe. As a result, 23 "nukes" are now in operation, with another hundred scheduled for the next decade. By the end of the century, about 1000 huge atomic plants will be scattered around the country, generating half our electricity.

In other words, we are on the verge of an all-but-irrevocable commitment to nuclear power. Yet now a group of respected scientists claims to have discovered a basic flaw in the plants' safety design—a flaw that "might well expose tens or hundreds of thousands of people to lethal doses of radioactivity." Their claims focus largely on the possibility of a weird occurrence known as the China Syndrome, a sequence of events that reads like a science-fiction nightmare.

Four basic questions are involved:
What are the chances of any one nuclear plant having a serious accident?

Extremely remote—if any safety rules are observed. To see how remote, I recently visited the Consolidated Edison Company's 965-million-watt Indian Point No. 3 plant, under construction 24 miles north of New York City. The key spot is the 250-foot-high, astrodome-like "containment structure"—a steel-jacketed security blanket of concrete, 4½ feet thick and entered only by double steel doors—that shields the outside world from the four-story-high steel "egg" that sits in the astrodome's center.

The egg is the reactor vessel, the plant's furnace. When loaded with radioactive fuel it will be deadly, but now you can climb down a ladder into its 14-foot-wide interior where eventually the uranium will heat the water that spins the turbines. As you descend, you are confronted by eight great tunnel mouths in the stainless-steel, circular wall surrounding you.

These tunnels—each big enough for a man to crawl into—are the pipes of the fuel coolant system. When the uranium is loaded into the egg—140 tons of little pellets, packed into 12-foot-long metal tubes which are bundled together like thousands of pencils—the system's 100,000 gallons of water will

constantly be rushing out of these tunnels at 30 m.p.h., bubbling up through the pencil bundles to keep them at the proper operating temperature of 600° F. Without this water the uranium would quickly heat up to more than 5000°—enough to trigger the China Syndrome.

Could the plant ever lose its crucial cooling water? It's hard to imagine. The pipes are stainless steel 2½ inches thick. During construction, the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) demands that every square inch of this steel be X-rayed or ultrasonically tested for flaws. Once the system starts up, about 100 pressure, temperature and radiation sensors will continuously monitor it—ready, at the first hint of a leak, to "scram" the reactor by snapping control rods into the fuel core and immediately stopping the fission.

What if a pump conks out? A backup emergency pump would automatically trip on; if this one failed, a second one would go on. What if the whole plant lost its power supply? Again, there's a first-backup and then a second-backup diesel generator. And if both of these failed, the reactor would automatically "scram" itself.

Could an external disaster knock out the water supply? Not likely. The steel girders supporting the system are designed to take five times the force of the worst earthquake envisioned for this region, and the big dome of the container is designed to withstand a tornado.

What if, despite all this, a pipe burst? Then a completely independent emergency-cooling system—including four tanks filled with 25,000 gallons of water, pressurized by gas—would snap into operation.

Two basic engineering principles are involved here: self-duplicating "redundancy" backed by super-cautious "conservative design." "In no other engineering activity has overall safety been considered in such detail," says Norman C. Rasmussen, professor of nuclear engineering at Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

But couldn't human error cause a failure of the safety systems? Here each side looks at the same set of facts and draws the opposite conclusions. The AEC and the atomic industry cite their past safety record: only seven fatal reactor accidents in three decades. All were inside reactor buildings; outside, not an injury has been recorded.

The other side says that no one knows whether long-term harm has been caused by radiation leakage to the outside; and that even the inside-the-plant figures mask the truth. If you look behind the conservative design requirements and impressive safety statistics, they say, you'll find lax enforcement by the AEC, sloppy operating practices by the industry—and some very close calls. For example:

Two years ago a worker in a nuclear plant being built near Norfolk, Va., complained to his bosses that joints in critical pipes were being improperly welded. The man was fired, but he kept writing to Congress and the AEC. The resulting investigations uncovered 94 defective welds, plus the violation of a long list of AEC quality-control rules: crucial radiographic inspections were being performed by plant workers instead of trained inspectors; the steel reinforcement of the containment dome was being improperly installed; cable wires from "redundant" systems were not kept separate but were bunched together—so a fire in one could knock them all out.

Critics say the fact that the AEC did not catch such serious violations until an employee complained reveals dangerously lax inspection procedures.* Often it has taken an actual accident to reveal problems.

*As this article goes to press, the AEC has begun investigating a similar complaint—this time by the president of a construction firm—of defective reactor installation on Con Ed's Indian Point site.

On June 5, 1970, a defective voltage meter in Commonwealth Edison's Dresden No. 2 plant near Chicago sent out an incorrect signal. This led to a two-hour sequence of human and mechanical errors that, says M.I.T. nuclear physicist Henry Kendall, revealed "irresponsibility, incompetence, poor design, inadequate maintenance and defective operating procedures." Safety valves remained open when they should have closed; instrument cables buckled because of crowding in their ducts; a water-level recorder stuck and gave a false reading until someone hit it; faulty instructions in the operating manual were compounded by "incorrect operator action"; and so on.

As the operators fought to keep control of their reactor, they twice violated their own operating rules; at one point they put ten times as much pressure on a crucial venting system as it had been designed for.

"For a period of minutes they actually lost control of the reactor's cooling water," says Professor Kendall, a member of the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS).

Before they regained control, some of this water—and with it a dose of radioactivity—escaped into the containment structure. Though three months were required to repair the damage, Commonwealth Edison says: "We did not even consider the shutdown to be an accident." Instead the company calls it an "incident" and points out that the plant's system of multiple safeguards did, in fact, work: no radiation escaped the confines of the plant.

What are the chances of an "incident" escalating to an "accident"? The pro-nuclears say the industry's past safety record proves the effectiveness of the "defense in depth" concept. The antis say that the industry is still in its infancy; soon, with hundreds of big plants all over the country, our luck will inevitably run out somewhere. In the words of nuclear physicist Ralph Lapp, former assistant director of the Argonne National Laboratory, "It appears a certainty we will have a serious nuclear accident before the year 2000."

If all the safeguards did go wrong, what's the worst that could happen? There could never be an atomic explosion; the reactor's uranium pellets are not rich enough, nor are there enough of them, to go bang. But the heat and poisonous radiation they give off are enormous. And here we come to the China Syndrome, the so-called "maximum credible accident."

First, assume there is a defective weld in a cooling-system pipe, and that a series of operating errors subjects it to abnormal pressure. The pipe splits open. Instantaneously, from a dozen different sensors, the order flashes out: Scram. The reactor shuts itself off.

But while the fission thus comes to an immediate stop, the heat in the rods cannot be quickly cut off. As the coolant water loses pressure, it turns to steam which—in about ten seconds of incredible noise and violence—spews out the pipe break into the containment structure. Now the emergency water supply is supposed to flood in and quench the reactor's heat. But suppose (as we shall see, a not untenable assumption) the water can't get inside the egg. Then, with nothing to cool it, the uranium starts heating up at the amazing rate of about 40 degrees a second. In a matter of minutes it hits 5000°, melts the great metal egg—and 200 tons of molten steel and uranium drip to the floor of the containment structure.

So massive and hot is this molten glob that no existing structure can contain it. Thus it melts through the container floor and proceeds straight into the earth—hence, the China Syndrome. It will never get anywhere near China (it will probably stop in a month or so a few hundred feet down). But once the simmering mass has escaped from the concrete structure its poisonous fumes

cannot be contained underground. Some percentage will be carried off in the groundwater supply, and some will rise through fissures to the surface, there to be spread by the wind.

What happens then depends on unpredictable. If the fuel is new it's relatively harmless; if it has been burning for a year it has built up the radioactive equivalent of one Hiroshima-size bomb for each million watts of electricity it has produced. Thus, if the accident happened just after a plant had been refueled with new pellets, and if the weather conditions were right, even the reactor's next-door neighbors might escape unscathed. And the other extreme?

The UCS, basing its estimates on AEC figures, says that if 20 percent of the radioactive gas from a 650-million-watt plant were to escape and be wafted away by a 6.5-m.p.h. wind, it could form a cloud that would have lethal effects over an area two miles wide and 75 miles long. How many people might die? Conceivably hundreds of thousands if the disaster hit one of the many reactors being built near big cities.

Proponents of nuclear power say it is the easiest thing in the world to predict such a disaster, and the hardest to prove that it won't happen. They also point out the two very big "ifs" that stand between the public and disaster: if the primary coolant is lost despite all the elaborate safeguards; and if the emergency water supply then fails too.

How sure are we, then, that a reactor's emergency cooling systems will work? This depends on how much faith one puts in computer predictions. No emergency system has ever been tested in actual operation. But the AEC and the industry say they have run so many tests on the individual parts working separately that they can put it all together in computer codes—and the computers tell them the systems will work.

The other side says it's extremely irresponsible to base decisions affecting so many lives on untested computer codes. They cite recently revealed documents showing that even top AEC scientists have grave doubts about the codes' accuracy. They also point out that, in one of the most important tests to date, the AEC's computer was proved wrong:

Last year, researchers purposely broke a pipe in an experimental model of a reactor, causing the egg to lose its cooling water. According to the computer, the emergency water was then supposed to flood into the egg. Instead, this water too was blown out the break, leaving the fuel rods with nothing to cool them. If the same thing had happened in a real reactor, it would have triggered the China Syndrome.

That, then, is the nuclear safety controversy. Certainly it should be resolved before we rush into a national commitment to nuclear electricity that may haunt us for generations. Sen. Mike Gravel (D., Alaska) has submitted a bill that would stop the licensing of more nukes until Congress can hold hearings to consider such questions as these:

Are there practical alternatives to fossil fuels and nuclear fission as power sources? Anti-atom people list several that are now merely farout ideas—fusion power, solar energy, chemically fueled power cells, etc. But some leading scientists say that a major national effort could make at least one of them practical by the 1980s. The AEC and the industry agree that fusion power (virtually radiation-free) will probably be harnessed—in 40 to 50 years. Meanwhile, they say, they have to keep splitting atoms.

Should the AEC control the nuclear power industry? When established in 1947, the AEC was given two basic assignments: to promote atomic development, and to regulate the industry this would help create. Critics insist that the two assignments are mutually contradictory, and they see this as the funda-

mental cause of what they consider the AEC's over-optimism on safety. They suggest taking the regulatory function away from the AEC and giving it to people whose professional reputations do not depend on proving the validity of past assurances.

Where to store the poisons? Used nuclear fuel remains radioactive for hundreds of thousands of years, and present plans call for storing it all in a Kansas salt mine. Critics say this represents the worst long-range threat of all: first, the growing danger of rail and highway accidents as more and more thousands of poisonous canisters converge on Kansas each year; second, the danger of a leak from the cave as thousands of tons of the stuff accumulate.

What do we do right now? Should we go ahead with the present nukes . . . or require them to be built underground . . . or ban them near big cities . . . or ban them altogether?

The utilities claim that even a temporary delay could be disastrous. They would have to give up years of planning and switch to entirely new programs at a time when we are already short of electricity. Also, atomic fuel is clean, whereas oil and coal foul the air and promote the devastation by strip-mining of hundreds of square miles annually. The environmentalists fighting hardest to stop air pollution and strip mining, says the industry, are the very ones fighting hardest to ban the atom. Is there any source of power that will satisfy these people?

Until recently, this crucial nuclear debate has been carried on by a relatively small number of specialists. Now it's high time to let the country as a whole get in on the action. For the country as a whole will have to live for years with the profoundly important results.

IS IT "HARD TO IMAGINE"?

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. Miller's article raises several technical questions which deserve further elaboration:

First, is it so "hard to imagine" how a loss-of-coolant accident could actually happen?

Second, is the present emergency core cooling system adequate to cope with all of the possible cooling emergencies? With just some of them? Or with none of them?

Third, is it really possible for catastrophic quantities of radioactivity to escape from the building?

These are matters on which I intend to make additional statements.

The real controversy lies not in technical matters, however, but in ethics. What kinds of gambles are proper, and what kinds are morally rotten?

CORRECTING FALLACIES OF MISLEADING MEDICAL CARE STATISTICS

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, statistics are often used as a vehicle for misleading the populace of this country in order to establish a persuasive argument for a certain cause and position. In an effort to clarify the present state of our "medical care" system in this Nation, in the mass of confusing statistics, Dr. Jack Schreiber, M.D., of Canfield, Ohio, has

written an article appearing in a recent issue of the periodical "Private Practice"—separating fact from fiction. It is my hope that I will bring Dr. Schreiber's effort to the attention of many by inserting his article in the RECORD. Dr. Schreiber's article is as follows:

THE "CRISIS": SEPARATING FACT FROM FICTION
(By Jack Schreiber, M.D.)

I. THE FALLACY OF SELECTED STATISTICS

The present medical care system in the United States is being challenged by numerous individuals and groups who often use misleading statistics to make their case.

Let's take a close look at their allegations:

A. Infant mortality

1. Invariably, infant mortality figures are quoted showing United States ranking 13th in the world, behind "progressive" countries such as Sweden, England, The Netherlands, West Germany, France, Finland, etc. The source of this information is the United Nations Demographic Yearbook—but the introductory chapter of the section on infant mortality states clearly that infant mortality statistics of different countries should not be used for comparison. The Yearbook points out that there are different standards of measurement. In the United States, for example, a baby is listed as a live birth if there is any sign of life, such as a heart beat in the umbilical cord. Some countries do not record a live birth unless the child takes a breath. Other countries do not list a live birth until the birth has been registered, sometimes weeks after birth.

In the United States, the responsibility of reporting births and deaths is clearly assigned to the physician. In many countries of the world this is a responsibility of the parents or the clergy. With no uniform method of measurement or reporting, comparing infant mortality figures is like comparing apples to potatoes.

United States figures are often compared to Sweden, with the "lowest" infant mortality rate in the world, but (1) the United States has over 200 million people and Sweden has about 8 million; (2) the United States covers over 3.6 million square miles, Sweden covers 170,000 square miles—slightly more than the state of California; (3) the United States has an extremely heterogeneous population, while Sweden has a relatively homogeneous population. The fact is, the United States has a much more complex problem to deal with. To suggest that the U.S. adopt Sweden's health system is like suggesting that New York City adopt the same type of public transportation system as Billings, Montana, because traffic congestion in Billings is much less than in New York City.

2. Even if there were uniform methods to measure these figures, infant mortality statistics are not a good index of the health care delivery system. Infant mortality is a social problem. Such factors as poor housing, poverty, malnutrition, ignorance, and racial ethnic differences are more closely related to infant mortality than such factors as the number of physicians and hospitals, or how medicine is practiced.

3. There are better yardsticks than infant mortality for measuring the status of health in a given nation. In the United States, for example, 70 percent of all deaths in 1969 were related to heart disease, strokes, and cancer. Only 2.2 percent of all deaths were classified as infant mortality.

B. Where the U.S. ranks high

According to the United Nations Yearbook, the United States has a lower mortality rate from tuberculosis, still the world's leading killer among infectious diseases—than any nation except Denmark, the Netherlands, and Australia.

We have better results in preventing death from pneumonia than half the countries that supposedly outrank us in infant mortality. (Our death rates from pneumonia in 1967 were 28 per 1000, compared to 51 per 1000 in Sweden and 66 per 1000 in England). The United States shows the lowest mortality figure in the world from bronchitis. Our ulcer mortality figures were just one half that of the Socialist countries of the western world. Only Japan and Australia have consistently had better results in cancer mortality figures over the years.

C. Good health—The real standard

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare recently released figures showing American children, ages 6 through 11, are taller and heavier on the average than any other national population in the world. American children, according to this report, have increased in height by one-half inch each decade for the past 90 years and increased in weight by 15-30 percent. An average 8-year-old American boy today, is almost 4.5 inches taller and 8-19 pounds heavier than his counterpart of 90 years ago. American adults, too, are taller and heavier than they were 90 years ago. If health care here is the worst in the western world, as critics claim, why are Americans fast becoming the largest people on earth?

If one insists on infant mortality comparisons, international comparisons are not particularly useful; the relevant information is whether the United States infant mortality record is improving or deteriorating. In 1940 the infant mortality rate in the U.S. was 47 per 1000 live births; in 1950, it was 29.2; in 1960 it was 26; in 1969 it was 20.7. In less than 30 years, the rate was cut in half.

II. THE FALLACY THAT MEDICAL CARE IS

TOO EXPENSIVE

A. Comparative costs

Those who would restructure the practice of medicine complain that medical care is too expensive.

Medical care too expensive? Not when compared to the cost of transportation. Each year the average American spends almost twice as much on his automobile as he does on his body. In 1968 the average American spent almost 19 cents of every dollar for food, while spending only 7 cents for medical care. Housing and household operation took 28.5 cents out of every spendable dollar.

Last year, the American people spent almost \$10 billion on tobacco and \$15.5 billion on alcoholic beverages. Add to this the \$33.5 billion spent for recreation, and the question of whether medical care is too expensive becomes, rather, a question of priorities.

The companion charge, heard all too often, is: "You doctors make too much money." Too much, compared to whom? Certainly not compared to some members of the construction industry, who, according to columnist Victor Riesel, will soon be earning \$50,000 a year. Many people in construction and manufacturing, being paid time and a half for overtime and double time for nights and Sundays, putting in a 70- or 80-hour week, as many physicians do, could take home more money, after taxes, than many physicians do. And this is to say nothing about education, fringe benefits, retirement plans, etc., which are not available to the private fee-for-service practitioner. Do doctors make too much compared to entertainers or professional athletes? We pay someone three or four times as much to play baseball as we pay a family doctor.

In 1970 the Consumer Price Index indicated that physicians' fees rose 7.5 percent over the previous year, while all services rose 8.1 percent. This would indicate that doctors are not out of line when properly compared with persons in other service professions.

B. Not all health costs are medical

Physicians' fees should be separated from the rest of the medical care package. Hospital costs, for example, have risen rapidly in the last decade, chiefly because of the adjustment of wages of underpaid employees. Figures for 1968-69 show that hospital care accounts for 56 percent of the total health bills under public programs, compared to only 13 percent for physicians' fees.

In all of the talk and anguish over rising costs, very few point out that the item most likely to bankrupt a family is not doctor bills, or even hospital bills, but taxes. In 1970, the tax burden for every man, woman, and child in this country was \$1,175 (\$4,700 per year for a family of four). This is a far cry from the \$540 per family of four (on the average) for all medical care; including the cost of hospitalization insurance for the same time period, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Many persons angered by the high income of doctors in the United States, hold the simplistic view that health care costs could be held down by reducing physicians' incomes. This would have only a minor effect. If the income of the nation's physicians was cut by more than half, the national expenditure for health care would be cut by a paltry eight-tenths of one percent.

C. Spreading out the cost

Like a payment for the family car, the payment for illness can be spread out. The average American visits his doctor four times per year, and probably goes to a hospital four or five times in his lifetime. These are fairly predictable costs and can be prepaid through the mechanism of health insurance. Almost 90 percent of all Americans have some form of health insurance, testifying to the fact that the majority of us can afford to be protected, just as we protect our homes against fire and our automobiles against damage. In the time period from 1956 to 1968, physicians' fees rose 3.7 percent. During that same time period, general wages rose 4.2 percent. Just as most of us can afford entertainment, travel and luxuries, we can afford good medical care, particularly if it is budgeted.

D. Perspective

Of course, medical care costs more today but a patient is in the hospital fewer days because of the increased knowledge and skill of the medical profession. The average laboring man today works fewer hours to pay for a higher grade of medical care than he did 10 years ago.

The average drug prescription today is \$3.62—and 80 percent of the drugs purchased today weren't even invented 10 years ago. Several dollars worth of antibiotic capsules today will cure lobar pneumonia, a disease which killed nearly half of all those who contracted it 25 years ago. The cost of tuberculosis treatment 20 years ago was staggering; today, patients can be treated at home with drugs which cost a fraction of what extended hospital care cost in 1950.

E. Foolish spending

Everyone has a stake in the cost of overall health care; the patient has just as much, or perhaps even more responsibility in this matter, than does the physician. Last year, it was estimated that the American people spent at least \$2 billion for quackery. This is more than all the money spent on health education. In this modern day, people still have a penchant for the worthless and sometimes harmful, and the often expensive gadget, ranging from the copper bracelet to the rainbow pills for dieting. Untold millions are spent on unnecessary frills which cost the American public far more than all the prescription drugs put together.

Since every accident is potentially avoidable, think of the enormous saving in the total cost of health care in this country if somehow we could do away with the injuries suf-

fered in 1969. In that year, 49 million people were injured—20 million at home, 9 million at work, 3.5 million on the highways, and 15 million in nonmoving motor vehicle accidents (while repairing, cleaning or performing work on motor vehicles). Of the 49 million injuries, 11 million were bed disabling. The total cost of accidents in 1969 was \$25 billion. Of this nearly \$3 billion was in medical fees and hospital expenses. Every cent of this was preventable.

What about the effects of alcohol? There are 60 million users of alcohol in this country, including an estimated 10 million alcoholics. This is part of the cost of medical care which has been called too expensive. And this too, is preventable. What about the effects of drug abuse? Last year, more young people died in this country from drug abuse than all the soldiers killed in Vietnam. This cost, plus the cost to hundreds of thousands of youngsters who are experimenting with drugs, and who need rehabilitation and medical care, is almost incalculable.

And finally, what about the average adult who overeats, doesn't get enough exercise, smokes too much and doesn't get enough rest. How much does self-abuse add to the cost of medical care in terms of hypertension, diabetes, lung cancer, strokes and hardening of the arteries? It might be safe to say that perhaps half of the total health care bill in this country is preventable.

III. THE AVAILABILITY OF MEDICAL CARE

A. The doctor shortage

Many, in and out of the medical profession, state that there is a doctor shortage in this country. While there may never be enough doctors in some areas in the United States, this country has more doctors per population than any major European nation—one for every 640 citizens. By comparison, France has one physician for every 750 people and Great Britain has one for every 1150 citizens. It is true, however, that many physicians have been drawn away from patient care by government inducements to research and administrative work. A total of 28,105 doctors are in government service (enough to supply three cities the size of Los Angeles).

The charge is frequently made that doctors don't make house calls anymore. According to a recent Medical Economics survey, most physicians still make house calls, but on a limited basis, due chiefly to the obvious limitations of time, and the opportunity to provide higher quality of care in one's "workshop," rather than at the bedside. Many laymen who still measure a good doctor by the number of house calls continue to live in the nostalgia of a day long past when the physician had fewer patients to treat and could perform the same service at the bedside as he did in an office with meager equipment.

B. Health facilities

But the doctor is only part of the total medical care system. What about hospitals? How do we compare with other nations which have the kind of system the politicians plan for this country? In 1969 the United States had 7,144 hospitals, up four percent since 1960. In Great Britain, no new hospitals were built from 1948 (the conception of the National Health Service) until 1962. Since then only 10 have been built. Since World War II, 515 new hospitals have been built in just 17 states in the southeastern part of our country, an area comparable in size to the United Kingdom. In most of post-war Europe, hospital construction has been at a standstill because of the lack of funds, in spite of the fact that in Sweden, for example, 20 percent of the Swedish citizens' taxes are for "free health care."

Not only do most Europeans have fewer hospitals than Americans, but the availability of hospital beds in Europe is less because of the longer length of stay. In 1969, in the United States, the average

length of stay in a non-federal, short-term, general hospital was 8.3 days. In England and Sweden the length of stay was 50 percent longer; in Germany it was 300 percent longer. (One might also compare non-federal, general hospitals with government hospitals in this country: In 1969 the 8.3 day average for private hospitals compared to 38.8 days for VA hospitals).

Because people stay longer in hospital beds in Europe, and because there are fewer hospitals per population, waiting lists also are a factor in the availability of hospital care. Most Americans are able to get into a hospital of their choice for elective surgery in two to four weeks. In England the waiting period may stretch to a year. Professor Russell Kirk reports that Britons have to wait up to seven years for treatment of hernias or varicose veins.

C. Free choice

Critics of our present health care delivery system usually fail to point out that if given a choice, citizens prefer to be cared for by their own personal physicians. In Sweden, private doctors are forbidden to treat their own patients in hospitals. Consequently, of the 8,500 doctors in that country, only 1,200 are in private practice (one-fifth of them over 70 years old). Only 30 percent of Swedish citizens are now treated by their own private physicians. A recent survey in England revealed that fewer than 50 percent of NHS patients get to see the specialist of their choice—and 42 percent are never even told the name of the specialist they do see.

D. Prepayment plans

Many politicians advocate government support for prepaid, closed panel group practices. One of the selling points to the medical profession is the potential 40-hour work week. Currently the average physician in private practice works a 65-hour week (according to *Medical Economics*). The question therefore is: Would the grouping of physicians in prepaid plans prototype make medical care more available, or would it create just the opposite result? Dr. Roger Egeberg, in a speech before the Ohio State Medical Association in 1970, stated that if all those physicians now working a 60- to 70-hour week were suddenly to limit their practices to 40-hour weeks, the result would be an immediate reduction equivalent to the loss of 50,000 physicians.

IV. SUMMARY

In summary, politicians and social planners have attempted to justify their demands for national health insurance by claiming: (1) Medical care is inferior, (2) Medical care is too expensive, and (3) Quality medical care is not available. Ironically, government health programs abroad, and even within our shores, have historically increased costs, lowered quality, and produced a relative shortage of personnel and facilities. No government can deliver high-quality, reasonably-priced medical care. Only physicians, practicing in a stimulating, pluralistic, competitive, free enterprise environment can do that.

FLUCTUATIONS IN WELFARE COSTS IN NEW YORK CITY

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, Newsweek magazine for June 5 contains an interesting analysis of the fluctuations in welfare costs in New York City. The article notes that the number of new welfare recipients in recent years

has tended to rise sharply in periods following mayoral elections and to drop dramatically during election campaigns.

The article notes that—

Every political-science major knows that city welfare budgets are notoriously sensitive to politics—perhaps nowhere more so than in the city of New York, where welfare costs last year reached an astonishing \$1.2 billion, up fourfold since incumbent Mayor John V. Lindsay first took office six years ago.

I am very much afraid that this is an accurate analysis. It is additional evidence that our present welfare system is subject to great abuse, and additional reason why genuine reform—not expansion, but true reform—is sorely needed. I ask unanimous consent that the analysis be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WELFARE AND POLITICS

Every political-science major knows that city welfare budgets are notoriously sensitive to politics—perhaps nowhere more so than in the city of New York, where welfare costs last year reached an astonishing \$1.2 billion, up fourfold since incumbent Mayor John V. Lindsay first took office six years ago. Last week, in the course of disagreeing with Lindsay's proposed 1972-73 budget and some of its welfare proposals, a New York Times editorial presented some fascinating figures on the way the city's welfare rolls rise and fall. In the first months after Lindsay's inauguration in 1966, the editorial noted, new welfare recipients were coming on the rolls at the rate of 2,700. But during the last six months of 1966 this figure rose to 11,500 a month and, by the beginning of 1968, to an incredible 17,700. Then when election time rolled around again in 1969, the welfare rolls began to shrink almost magically. By just before election day, the peak rate had been reduced by two-thirds, and only 6,300 were coming on the rolls monthly. This enabled Lindsay to claim in his campaign for reelection that he had begun sharp reductions in the staggering cost of welfare. How long did this state of affairs continue? Not very long. Six months after Lindsay had taken the oath of office a second time, welfare recipients were once again coming on the rolls at the lively clip of 15,800 a month.

Last week, faced with City Council demands for stringent cuts in New York's new budget, Lindsay announced he could effect savings of at least \$120 million annually, mainly by keeping down the number of new welfare recipients and cracking down on those who get welfare payments illegally.

CORRECTION OF ROLLCALLS

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, on May 11, I was mistakenly recorded as having voted "yea" on the motion—rollcall No. 144—to instruct the conferees to insist on the House version of the antibusing provisions. I actually voted "nay" on this vote, which was consistent with my previous vote—rollcall No. 66—on March 8. I believe that we should not have instructed the conferees on a matter as complicated and involved as antibusing legislation.

ORGANIZED LABOR'S UMBRELLA KEEPS ITS CRITICS DRY AND COMFORTABLE

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, for those who may have forgotten, Mrs. Midge Decter recalls the meaningful contributions of organized labor over the years. Mrs. Decter, who is managing editor of World magazine, and former managing editor of Harpers magazine, delivered her recollections on the occasion of a Tribute to George Meany, sponsored by the League for Industrial Democracy. Her remarks follow:

ORGANIZED LABOR'S UMBRELLA KEEPS ITS CRITICS DRY AND COMFORTABLE

It it perhaps a breach of proper manners for me to begin my remarks on an occasion of a celebration such as this with a reference to the unhappy—I will not say unredeemed—decade through which this nation has just passed.

These past five years have not been happy years for the labor movement; they cannot have been altogether happy years for you either, Mr. Meany. I presume to make such a judgment, though I am of course a stranger to the daily work and circumstance which must in the end be the true life of the labor movement—indeed, I claim a kind of primary right to make such a judgment—because as an intellectual and a working journalist I have been living for these same years disquietingly close (one might say in the very heartlands) of the source of that unhappiness. I mean, of course, the question of the place of the labor movement in fashionable political opinion—and most particularly, and particularly unhappily, in fashionable advanced liberal opinion. Those who had once been labor's most natural allies, namely the reformist intellectuals and the seemingly most vocal of my colleagues in the liberal press, had abandoned the labor movement for a rapid succession of self-styled and, alas, infinitely more romantic proletariats: glamorous swashbucklers among the heralds of racial revolution; students; women.

I need not go through the whole sodden history here. What is important to note is that beneath the particular details of the ever-lengthening indictment of labor being brought by its erstwhile and now so-fickle allies among the intellectuals and liberal journalists ran a single unbroken and unspoken thread of attitude. The labor movement was being charged with having had the bad taste and graceless temerity to achieve a wholesome number of its purposes. The success of the labor movement—that very success it would have been so much more appropriate for me simply to celebrate this afternoon—in having established its now-inalienable right to live and grow and pursue the ordinary daily interests of its constituency is what, I am afraid, has brought about the alienation of our noisy intelligentsia from this movement.

There are, no doubt, several reasons for this. One might point to the spiritual quirk among so many intellectuals by which they are enslaved to the love of those who cannot live and grow and recognize the simple outlines of their own best interest but rather must continue to suffer in futile and grandiose hopelessness. One might suggest of such intellectuals and leftist journalists that they tend to a romantically brutal disdain for the terms and limitations of everyday existence—including, I might add, even their own.

In essence, though, I think the most im-

portant account of this recent alienation is the simplest: that is, that in the success of the labor movement lies the indispensable guarantee of the success of the American social order itself. A weak labor movement, embodying and symbolizing the inability of American institutions and social processes to accommodate the basic needs of the majority of its citizenry—such a weak labor movement could have remained the object of deepest piety. The labor movement we actually have, however—which, despite the long road it has yet to travel in the establishment of economic justice, has yet become the single most powerful vindication of the American social order—was bound on that very account to have become instead the object of hostility. America's most richly rewarded intellectuals do not wish to see the American social order succeed. They wish to see it fail. Its failure, of course, would sap the roots of the existence of these intellectuals as much as it would those of any other Americans.

But it is the luxury of the stability that you and your movement, Mr. Meany, have brought to the American social order—and will continue to maintain on its, and on all our, behalf—which makes it possible for the free-thinking, free-speaking, comfortable and secure enemies of that order to continue in the plying of their reckless trade. As the nations of Western Europe, secure under the American nuclear umbrella, liberated from the palling economic necessities of their own defense, were freed thereby to become heedless critics of American foreign policy, so have my colleagues, under the umbrella of the success of American pluralist society in general, and of the labor movement in particular, been freed to deplore, as recklessly and self-servingly as they wish, the fruits of both our political liberty and our economic achievement.

Some of us beneath that umbrella, however, do remember that it is here and stop from time to time—as we do here this afternoon—to bless our fate.

PROUD OF FARM TIES

HON. BOB BERGLAND

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. BERGLAND. Mr. Speaker, Washington Columnist Jack Anderson has provided great services to this country. He has revealed many shortcomings in all branches of Government and industry. I am hopeful, that because of his efforts, we will be able to correct our mistakes.

Yesterday, June 4, he discussed what he considers to be conflicts of interest among Members of the U.S. House of Representatives. Banking, the law, real estate, oil, lumber, broadcasting, even undertaking came within Mr. Anderson's scrutiny. It is not unusual to see in print the misconception that Congressmen are overpaid and do not need any outside income, especially from a business related to our work in the committees and on the floor of the House. I was rather surprised however, that because I am a family farmer serving on the Agriculture Committee, to find my name included with what Mr. Anderson calls "a long string of conflicts."

Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to follow that reasoning. If I, as someone who knows the problems of the family farmer

through my own experience, am ineligible to serve on the Agriculture Committee, no Member of Congress who pays taxes could be eligible to serve on the Committee on Ways and Means. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that distinguished committee would have to be dissolved.

I am proud of my ties with the family farmer and I know that farmers would agree that they have needed a voice on the Agriculture Committee.

As a farmer for 20 years I have known both feast and famine on the land. Unfortunately, there has been more famine than feast and it is my goal to correct the grave injustices heaped up on the family farmer. I know what it means to have a crop washed out. I know what it means to have the bottom drop out of the farmer's market. I know what it is like to have notes and taxes due with not enough money to go around. I have watched our smaller communities dry up and have seen the deterioration of health care, housing and public services as the farmer leaves the countryside.

Mr. Speaker, I freely admit that farming is not a hobby with me. It is my livelihood, my way of life. As long as I am allowed to serve in this body I will continue to do everything possible for the family farmer and rural America which is dependent on him for its very existence. I will do it not only because I will one day return to the farm, but because the preservation of the family farm is essential for every man, woman, and child in this Nation and millions of hungry people throughout the world.

THE ARMY CHANGED ITS PLANS

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, for those who are curious as to how we are able to maintain our Vietnam troops reduction at a time of renewed pressure on the enemy, without increasing draft calls and when many of us would suspect our casualties have increased substantially, the following should provide an explanation of where 30,000 of these men were found:

THE ARMY CHANGED HIS PLANS

As many of your readers undoubtedly know, the U.S. Army recently cancelled an early out program and extended some 30,000 men past their expected ETS (time of separation). Personally, I was told ten days before I was scheduled to get out that I would be required to serve another three months. I am only glad that I had made no firm plans, unlike one man I know, who had already paid his tuition for summer school. This extension is not only an excellent example of the callousness with which the Army plans, or rather attempts to plan, the lives of the people unfortunate enough to be trapped in the Army, but is also an equally valid example of the general inefficiency and high level of incompetency prevalent in all levels of the Army, but especially in the higher command levels. This even tops the time that I was told by my company commander that I, being low ranking and single, must move back into the barracks from an off-post apartment so that

the Army can build more housing for married couples on post. Really.

Why 30,000 men and women should suffer drastic changes in their personal plans for the future because of a few mistakes made by some hare-brained Pentagon planners is beyond me. I suppose the basic reason why I have been extended is that not enough people re-enlisted or enlisted during the past few months. I wonder why.

SP4 JOHN W. PENDLETON, JR.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. MARGARET MAYER

HON. EARLE CABELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, a longtime associate and personal friend of mine, Mrs. Margaret Mayer, has just recently traveled with the President to Russia as a member of the press pool. Mrs. Mayer, the Washington correspondent for the Dallas Times Herald, is one of the most respected newspaperwomen around. In the Dallas Times Herald an editorial was written about Mrs. Mayer by Felix McKnight, an editor of the paper and one of her colleagues. He says all the things so well that we who have admired Margaret have known all along.

The editorial follows:

ROSES FOR A LADY

(By Felix R. McKnight)

Margaret Mayer sat off to the side of the ornate banquet table in Moscow last Monday night and watched as President Nixon traded vodka toasts with the Soviet hierarchy.

Richard M. Nixon is not much of a drinking man and Margaret Mayer is not much of a drinking woman; never on the job. But in Russia you don't dodge the uplifted vodka and the accompanying rhetoric that serves as the chaser.

Words that come from the Russian toasts sometimes shape a future. Margaret Mayer was ear-cupping to hear each syllable.

She was there as one of the most skilled newspaperwomen in the trade; a member of the news media "pool" of three or four who report to the hundreds of other newsmen outside about what went on inside. The "pool" is a pro group; not for novices.

The words of Richard Nixon did, indeed, make world news and Margaret Mayer, Dallas Times Herald Washington correspondent, passed them on to tens of millions from the historic summit session.

Since 1951—first in the Times Herald Austin Bureau, since 1966 in the Washington Bureau—Margaret Mayer has been reporting the political and national scene "where intrigue is supreme." It is as much of her as the marrow in her bones.

Margaret is attractive by all gal standards. Medium height, flashing eyes, well groomed. Articulate because she does her homework; tenacious when in quest of news and eminently fair in her final judgments.

Personalities are never tarnished by her reporting—unless they damn well need tarnishing. She will not brook double-dealing. She protects values and respects the individual's rights. She scorns the tawdry and plows the straight furrow of fact.

She can walk into any office in Washington, except the President's, because she has been there before and left with respect. Sometimes, grudging respect if the facts as she found them hurt a bit.

She is a confidante of presidents and cabinet members because they trust her. She could write a devastating best-seller if she chose to sell the confidence of big men—but she won't. Muckraking isn't her dish.

The Margaret Mayer stories come in bundles but perhaps one is the most illustrative of her clout.

In 1960, Lyndon B. Johnson, aspiring to the Democratic presidential nomination, scheduled a press conference in a model home exhibit at the Los Angeles Coliseum grounds. It was surrounded by a cyclone fence and well policed.

Margaret swung up to the gate, press badge plainly visible, and started through the entrance. A six-foot, six Los Angeles policeman seized her elbow, opened his mouth for something that was never said.

"Take your hands off me, you big so-and-so!" steamed Margaret.

The man mountain in blue withdrew his hand and she marched in. I was next in line and the officer turned to me and asked:

"Is she really a newspaperman?"

I assured him Maggie Mayer was very much of a "newspaperman."

"Gee," the officer sputtered, "I'll bet she's a helluva good one!"

And she is. She can outwork and outfox any newsman in sight, and does. In these past 12 days she covered the shooting of Gov. George Wallace and kept hospital vigil until 3 a.m.; next morning showed up at The White House on a tip and covered the resignation of Secy. John Connally; took care of her other Washington chores for four days and then flew off to Russia with the Presidential party.

To those who have savored her beautiful word story of the memorable week in Russia you get the feel of the day-and-night firsthand reporting that makes her different from the rest of the crowd.

The Germanic stamina comes from staunch parents. The meticulous touch? Her father was a watchmaker-jeweler.

RED MASSACRES IN CHURCH, AN LOC HOSPITAL REPORTED

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, those who, in the name of peace, fly the Vietcong flag and shout slogans of victory for the Communists should pay close attention to the following UPI story which appeared in Sundays Washington Star.

If this is the kind of immoral activities they support then so be it. But if they have had enough and can no longer stomach these atrocities against innocent men, women, and children, let them speak. In either event, Americans everywhere are anxiously waiting.

The article follows:

RED MASSACRES IN CHURCH, AN LOC HOSPITAL REPORTED

SAIGON.—A U.S. adviser back from An Loc says he witnessed a Communist tank massacre 100 women and children inside a church in the besieged city.

Later the same day, he said, North Vietnamese artillery opened up on a hospital and killed all its occupants.

Army Capt. Harold Moffett of Nashville, Tenn., told UPI correspondent Barney Seibert today that on a day in mid-April, "I personally saw a Russian-bull tank go into a church where services were being held and kill 100 people—women and children."

That night, Moffett said, wounded soldiers and civilians were moved into a "clearly marked hospital. The North Vietnamese blew it away with mortar and artillery fire and killed every last one of the people inside."

Moffett spent 53 days in An Loc, 60 miles north of Saigon and under Communist siege for the last 49 days. He said there still are hundreds of civilians there—some in government-occupied areas and others in Communist-held pockets of the city.

FREE SPEECH AND THE PRESIDENT

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when election-year rhetoric is escalating, voices of reason and moderation rise above the din so rarely that we should pay them special heed. Following is an editorial which appeared in the Washington, D.C., Catholic Standard last month, in which the students of Catholic University are reproved for their opposition to a rumored visit by President Nixon to the campus.

The editor takes no exception to the students' political opinions, but objects to their virulent protests against the expression of a different point of view. He reminds us that the privilege of free speech must be extended to all if it is to be respected by any. The President of the United States is entitled to the same constitutional rights as any private citizen and deserves, moreover, an added measure of consideration because of the dignity of his office.

That such an editorial needs to be written at all is an unfortunate barometer of the extremism which polarizes the political process at times in this country. But necessary it is, and thoughtful men should give it due attention.

The editorial follows:

CITIZENS BEWARE?

A small group of Catholic University students, presumably aided and abetted by some faculty members, recently passed out leaflets accusing President Nixon of extortion and criminal genocide. The leaflet, headed "Citizens Beware—Nixon Is Coming," said in part: "Our message is simple and clear: Nixon cannot appear on the Catholic University of America campus. We will work to insure that he not appear on any university in our country until he ceases this criminal genocide of the peoples of Vietnam."

The reason for this tirade was a rumor that the President would appear at CU's commencement on Saturday. University officials said they had no knowledge that the President planned to visit the campus.

Whether or not Mr. Nixon shows up is beside the point. The point is that wherever the President of the United States appears he should be treated with the respect due his office. It should be possible to disagree with the President on any issue without branding him as the most despicable war criminal since Attila the Hun.

Those responsible for the leaflet apparently believe that 1) their views on the Vietnam war are irrefutably correct, 2) anyone who disagrees is not only mistaken but also a vicious criminal, 3) their view—and only their view—is the only one that can be

heard on campus and 4) they have a right to disrupt a graduation ceremony to prevent any remarks on any subject by a President who doesn't share their views.

This storm trooper attitude is contemptible. Those in academic circles generally hold great store by free speech and the mutual exchange of ideas in an atmosphere of reasonable discussion. But not this group. Free speech presumably applies only to them. Anyone else has to be shouted down or prevented from coming on campus.

Fortunately only a tiny minority of CU students hold this yahoo viewpoint. It's too bad that their antics besmirch the university.

LET US STOP 'EM IN THEIR TRACKS

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, little more than a week ago, I inserted in the RECORD the text of an article which dealt with a Chicago newspaperman's plan to legalize the machinegun. That proposal, by Mike Royko, apparently was a response to those people, including myself and some of my colleagues, who want strict handgun control—especially a ban on the sale and manufacture of handguns. In that article, he suggested the legalization of machineguns, because not everyone is an accurate shot with a pistol, and the machinegun offers many more advantages as a weapon of self-defense. Mr. Royko made some telling points in that article, and in the interests of fair play, I thought it would be appropriate to insert in the RECORD a subsequent article on the subject by Mr. Royko:

LET US STOP 'EM IN THEIR TRACKS

(By Mike Royko)

A few nights ago I was awakened by sounds outside the window. They sounded like footsteps in the gangway.

My first thought was that it had to be either a dangerous criminal or a Communist. And there I was without a machinegun.

(As some you know, I am the founder of the National Machinegun Assn., which will lobby to legalize the machinegun for the benefit of those of us who are bad shots with pistols. We, too, have a right to protect hearth and home.)

As things turned out, though, a machinegun would have been of little use that night.

When I tried to raise the screen to look out the window, it stuck and made a squeaking noise. By the time I opened it, the footsteps were fading into the distance. There would have been no opportunity to get off even one burst of fire.

The result would have been the same had I opened the front door. It was a noisy lock. And the screen door sticks.

In the morning I learned that the footsteps had been those of someone who entered my neighbor's car and removed two radio speakers.

The police said he was a "sneak thief." But one can't be sure. He might have been a Communist who was equipping a secret radio room.

In any case, this experience taught me that a gun—even a machinegun—doesn't always protect an honest citizen against criminals, Commies, and creatures of the night.

There are times when something else is needed.

The answer is the land mine.

Land mines, like machineguns, are illegal. Yet, it should be obvious that for many people the land mine is the ideal—indeed, the only—weapon with which they can defend themselves.

These people would include the elderly, the extremely deep sleeper, the weak-eyed, the hard of hearing, and those who cannot stand the sight of a gun.

For them, a gun is useless—even the machinegun. A fiend could be at their throats before they even finished a prayer.

These people are being penalized and endangered by the laws which restrict a citizen's weaponry to rifles, shotguns and pistols.

But if they could place a few land mines in and around their homes—under a throw rug, in the lawn, the back steps, the back yards, and under the welcome mat—an evil doer would be stopped in his tracks. All that would remain of him would be his tracks, which would be his just deserts.

Yet, these people are being penalized and left defenseless because our laws restrict a citizen's weaponry to rifles, shotguns and pistols.

It doesn't make any sense that anyone can buy a pistol for \$8, while an honest citizen, who wants nothing more than to enforce his "keep out" sign, should not be able to buy a land mine.

Before I continue, let me anticipate some of the objections that will be raised by the anti-gun, anti-land mine peaceniks.

"You can't use something that can kill you just because you step on it."

That is ridiculous. You can be injured, even killed, by stepping on a roller skate, a banana peel, a mud puddle, or a sleeping dog.

But is that any reason to outlaw roller skates, bananas, rain, or sleeping dogs?

Then there will be the familiar cry: "Land mines kill."

Nonsense. Land mines don't kill. People who step on land mines kill. If you don't step on it, it is as safe as a turnip.

And the only people who would be endangered would be those who are walking where they don't belong.

Oh, I admit that there is always the possibility of regrettable accidents. Nothing is fool proof. A few children, pets, inebriated neighbors and deliverymen might be lost.

But probably no more than are killed each year by handguns. And no clear thinking, decent American would deprive his fellows of their rights because a few children, policemen, store keepers and others are shot each day by legalized, \$8 pistols.

Remember, no President, or even a candidate for President, has ever been assassinated with a land mine.

So I urge all of you who are concerned about the safety of the elderly, the deep sleepers, the near sighted, and hard of hearing, to write to your congressman, senator, coroner, postmaster, alderman, precinct captain, the President, vice president, ambassador to the Court of St. James's, your religious leaders, union leaders, newspapers, the National Rifle Assn., and Howard Miller.

Urge them to support much-needed legislation that would make the ownership of land mines legal.

Then we will see if anybody messes with my neighbor's car radio.

LESSON OF CHINA

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, last week an editorial appeared in the Green Bay

Press-Gazette dealing with Barbara Tuchmann's excellent book "Stillwell and the American Experience in China," and the lessons our China experience may provide with regard to Vietnam. The editorial follows:

LESSON OF CHINA

In her magnificent book, "Stillwell and the American Experience in China," Barbara Tuchmann probably cannot help but read into the discouraging history the similarity to the American role in Vietnam. The really uncomfortable fact is not that the United States should make such a serious mistake once but that it should almost copy it in Vietnam.

Whatever the Chinese desperation at the ruthless Japanese invasion, the Nationalist government was never able to organize a defense much less mount an offensive. Mrs. Tuchmann blames the Chiang Kai-shek hierarchy. But whatever the merits or drawbacks of Gen. Joseph Stilwell's policies and those of the flamboyant Gen. Clare Chen-nault in how the war in China should be fought, it became obvious that eventually Chiang became assured that the Americans would eventually defeat the Japanese so that his primary concern was his own retention of power particularly against the forces of Mao Tse-tung. Chiang's great concern as the war neared an end was to keep complete control of the Chinese army while at the same time not losing massive American foreign aid.

Stilwell was recalled at Chiang's insistence. The men never did get along, and part of the trouble may have been a personality clash as the United States explained at the time of the recall. But in the light of future events it seems obvious that the Nationalists had long ago lost the support of the population and the Communists indeed were "better men physically, better fed, better clothed . . . with better morale than the Nationalist troops" as Gen. Frank Dorn, a one-time aide to Stilwell, later testified.

But for domestic political reasons, as well as because of concern of the effect in other parts of the world, the United States could not publicly concede the truth. The Chinese Nationalists had been portrayed to the American public much as the South Vietnamese have been—inherently of a democratic nature, fighting courageously for their dignity and freedom against great odds. Obviously, the Chinese Nationalists could no more be abandoned to the truth in 1944 than the South Vietnamese could be in 1972. "We must not indefinitely underwrite a politically bankrupt regime" warned John Stewart Service, later to be condemned for his realism toward Asian affairs.

Mrs. Tuchmann writes, "the option to end support of China was almost taken . . . but the United States could not afford to do it." President Roosevelt believed in sovereignty for allied governments but it could not really be achieved any more than it has in South Vietnam. "The United States too was concerned with face saving," she writes. So Stilwell came home. "The recall was the inevitable outcome of the assumption, growing out of China's dependence and passivity, that an American solution could be imposed on China," Mrs. Tuchmann writes.

Mrs. Tuchmann concludes that "the American effort to sustain the status quo could not supply an outworn government with strength and stability or popular support. It could not hold up a husk nor long delay the cyclical passing of the mandate of heaven. In the end, China went her own way as if the Americans had never come."

It won't be quite that way in Vietnam. There are millions of the dead and the refugees in that torn country who will not be exactly the same again. But the end political result still could be the same.

ANGELA DAVIS AND AMERICAN HISTORY

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, on June 4, 1972, Angela Davis was acquitted by an all-white jury in San Jose, Calif. Following the announcement of the jury's verdict, Miss Davis stressed that she held no greater confidence in this country's judicial system than before, but that—

The people who sat as jurors [were] not part of the judicial system, but of the people.

The breach between our Government and the people it purports to govern has become increasingly evident in recent political trials. From the Chicago 7 through the Catonsville 9 to Angela Davis, a pattern has developed. On the flimsiest charges, the Government has brought people to trial who happen to disagree with the official interpretation of events. In each case, the victims of these witch hunts have been vindicated by the American people, represented by those in the jury box. In each case, the defendants have been acquitted because of insufficient evidence, a fact which, alone, should cause us to wonder.

Angela Davis was a perfect target for official castigation. A Communist, a black American, a woman—she failed to fit into any of the slots which society had carved out for her. She has always been an intelligent and fiercely independent young woman who carries with her the historical baggage that all black Americans carry—a memory of slavery, repression, and rejection. Most white Americans have refused to take the trouble to understand what it is like to have this particular memory. The San Jose jury took that trouble, and they are to be heartily commended for the results of their painstaking efforts.

On May 24, 1972, a column by Roger Wilkins appeared in the Washington Post. His article was called "Children of Slavery: Parents and Black Liberation." Roger Wilkins articulated, for readers of the Post, the meaning of Angela Davis' personal struggle in terms of her symbolic battle in behalf of all black Americans. On the same page, the Post carried one of Miss Davis' letters to George Jackson. This letter is a beautiful and succinct pronouncement upon what life is like for a black woman in this country.

I urge my colleagues to take this opportunity to try to understand, as the San Jose jury did, what people like Angela Davis are all about. I, therefore, include Roger Wilkins' column and Miss Davis' poetic letter below:

CHILDREN OF SLAVERY: PARENTS AND BLACK LIBERATION

(By Roger Wilkins)

The first "love letter" from Angela Davis to George Jackson introduced by the prosecution at Miss Davis' trial in California for murder offers an extraordinary glimpse into the mind of a young black woman as she struggles with one of the still live and anguishing legacies of slavery. During the late sixties, when young angry black rhetoricians lashed America because of three hundred

years of oppression and recited the whole litany of slavery, the standard white response was, "What has this generation—white or black—to do with that period of our distant history?" But in writing to the man she loved, as a black woman caught up in the struggle for black liberation, Angela Davis had still to be deeply involved in the slow black psychic climb up out of the slime and ooze of slavery. In this letter, excerpts from which appear elsewhere on this page, her issue is whether the survival techniques and the perceptions of black needs developed prior to 1865 and persisting even now are suited to the needs and demands of black society.

The problem Miss Davis confronts runs in an unbroken line from the defense mechanisms blacks developed for survival during the brutal and violent days when they were chattel straight into the gust and spirits of today's black parents struggling with the excruciating problems of raising their children in a still racist America—an America that seems to think it has done enough about the racial problem and is both weary of the issue and hostile even toward such minor innovations as busing and scatter site housing. She knows the parents will be tempted to be "overly protective" by dissuading their children from accepting the "burden of fighting this war which has been declared on us," on the one hand while seeing the need to hand the sons of the race a "flaming sword" on the other.

During slavery, both black men and black women performed as beasts of burden from dawn to dusk, but in a very substantial measure, that was the man's sole function. In order to turn men into beasts, it was imperative for the society to keep them docile. Male slaves could be murdered, punished brutally, sold down the river away from family and friends and have their faces pressed into the mud in hundreds of other more subtle ways until manhood was little more than a scream of anguish that died in the throat before it was heard.

Women seemed less threatening and were thus often given positions of trust at the mouths of white babies, and in the kitchens of the great houses or of sexual servitude, to master, master's son, overseer or visiting fireman. The women did what they had to do for their own survival and to protect children, husbands and friends. They saw clearly the perils in store for the black man-child and, over generations and centuries, they devised ways to raise their boys to survive in the world they knew: "Keep your nose clean, hang back, work hard, succeed, escape, become 'non-nigger'."

After slavery, little changed in those patterns. The black male was still systematically degraded. Women could get jobs because people needed domestics and the American fantasy grew enough to include a black woman teacher, nurse or social worker, but could not encompass a black male supervisor or executive. Meanwhile, up through the black revolution of the sixties, black mothers kept teaching the same old survival course to their children. They did so, partially because their own paths to progress were blocked and so they poured all of their hopes and all of their ambitions into their children, and partially because they wanted to save the children from both named and unknown perils.

Then came the revolution of blackness during the late 60s and the rise of black male consciousness. Cultists and others, raging at an abundance of injustices—many real, some imagined—began firing at any moving target. Black women loomed large in many sights; they were told "you have crushed our manhood and bled us of our blackness. We are men now and are prepared to take care of business while your role is to keep quiet, succor and love, while I fight and define my blackness."

This is where Miss Davis parts company with much of the new black thought. She clearly understands the parental instinct to protect the cub, but she knows that the old survival patterns no longer work, for even when they do "work", they often produce individualistic, white-like people, alienated from the black experience, people who stand alone, above and aside, identifying with little of the pain and soaring with none of the joy of engagement and occasional victory. The struggle, as she says, must now be collective. Renewed white resistance coupled with the still abysmal circumstances of the lives of at least half of black America requires a strategy of more ingenious and diversified black initiatives springing from both the talents and needs of a more unified black community than has ever previously existed.

Whether Miss Davis was speaking metaphorically when she talked about squeezing rather than jerking the trigger and rejoicing over the running blood of a policeman is something a jury in San Jose will soon begin to ponder. But no one who walks the streets of the poorest black communities in this country can doubt that desperate struggles, the contours of which are yet unknown, lie ahead. Eyes in black spirits see what white blindness and indifference fail to perceive: alleys where children play amidst rubble and wine-soaked bodies, tenements where families sleep eight to a room, grammar schools where heroin pushers peddle their wares to ten year olds and empty shells lurching along streets where men should walk. Nor is there any doubt about the rage such sights engender in the core of every black with a living spirit, whether or not that age is articulated as openly as Miss Davis does in her letter.

Nor can he believe that there is an asset anywhere more precious to the future of black America than her children. Each mother will struggle with the knowledge of the pain that lies ahead for her child. Her instinctive desire to erect an iron protective mechanism around his spirit will do fierce battle with her knowledge that the black community needs him to live his life at full throttle and great risk while pouring his main force into the struggle for black liberation. If the parents choice is the latter, Miss Davis is right. That race of giants won't be developed by strong men and crippled mothers. Rather, it will arise from families headed by two whole human beings who set examples by being fully engaged in the most serious business of America, and who have the full courage to grow and to launch the child in the hope that none of them—whether parent or child—will flinch in the face of the awesome challenges that are sure to come.

LETTER TO GEORGE JACKSON—ANGELA DAVIS: STRUGGLE, SURVIVAL

It is already impossible to begin at the beginning. If I start by dropping the mask and say in all naturalness: I have come to love you very deeply, I count on you to believe me, George. I have used these words very seldom in my 26 years—because I could not have meant them very often. Believe me, it happened so abruptly, so spontaneously. I was not seeking to love when I walked into a Salinas courtroom on Friday, May 8, 1970. And so it is difficult to articulate it further. But one thing remains to be said—my feelings dictate neither illusionary hopes nor intolerable despair. My love—your love, reinforces my fighting instincts, it tells me to go to war . . .

Concerning black women: I am convinced that the solution is not to persuade the black woman to relax her reins on the black male, (but to translate) the "be a good boy" syndrome into a "take the sword in hand" attitude . . . to take our first step towards freedom, we, too, must pick up the sword.

Only a fighting woman can guide her son in the warrior direction. Only when our lives—our total lives—become inseparable from struggle can we, black women, do what we have to do for our sons and daughters . . .

My mother was overly protective of her sons and daughters. I could never forgive her for forcing my bothers (us, too) to take dancing lessons. George, we must dig into all the muck and get at the roots of our problems . . . When we are overly protective, we attempt to dissuade our loved ones from accepting the burden of fighting this war which has been declared on us, we cannot be dismissed as counter revolutionary. You'd be surprised how many brothers would say this. Nor can it be said that we ought to blot our natural instincts for survival. Why, why, is our condition so wrought with contradictions? We, who have been coerced into performing the most degrading kinds of labor—a sex machine for the white slave master. Rather than helplessly watch her children die a slow death of starvation, my grandmother submitted to the white master, my father's accursed father . . .

To choose between various paths of survival means the objective availability of alternatives. I hope you don't take this as an apologetic stance. I'm only trying to understand the forces that have led us, black women, to where we are now. Why did your mother offer you reprimands instead of the flaming sword? Which is equivalent to posing the same question about every other black woman—and not only with respect to the sons, but the daughters too (this is really crucial. In Cuba last summer, I saw some very beautiful Vietnamese warriors . . . all female . . . I saw women patrolling the streets with rifles on their backs—defending the revolution. But also, young companions educating their husbands, and lovers—demystologizing machismo. After all, if women can fight, manage factories, then men ought to be able to help with the house, children.

But returning to the question—we have learned from our revolutionary ancestors that no individual act or response can seize the scepter of the enemy. The slave lashes out against his immediate master, subdues him, escapes, but he has done nothing more than take the first step in the long spiral upwards towards liberation. And often that individual escape is an evasion of the real problem. It is only when all the slaves are aroused from their slumber, articulate their goals, choose their leaders, make an unwavering commitment to destroy every single obstacle which might prevent them from transcribing their visions of a new world, a new man onto the soil of the earth, into the flesh and blood of men.

Even dreams are often prohibited or are allowed to surface only in the most disguised and sublimated form—the desire to be white, the monstrous perverted aspirations of a so-called black bourgeoisie, created to pacify the masses. And then there is the unnatural system-oriented desires of a black woman who is relating to the survival of her children. . . .

The point is—given the vacuum created by the absence of collective struggle, the objective survival alternatives are sparse: ambitious of bourgeois gluttony or—like you said—unconscious crime. One path goes in thru the front door, the other sneaks in thru the back and is far more dangerous and seemingly far less likely to reach its destination. . . .

A mother cannot help but cry out for the survival of her own flesh and blood. We have been forbidden to reach out for the truth about survival—that is a collective enterprise and must be offensive, rather than defensive. . . .

Frustrations, aggressions cannot be repressed indefinitely. . . . For the black female, the solution is not to become less aggressive, not to lay down the gun, but to learn how to set the sights correctly, aim

accurately, squeeze rather than jerk, and not be overcome by the damage. We have to learn how to rejoice when pig's blood is spilled. But all this presupposes that the black male will have purged himself of the myth that his mother, his woman, must be subdued before—he—can wage war on the enemy. Liberation is a dialectical movement—the black woman can liberate herself from all the muck—and it works the other way around and this is—only—the beginning. . . . Women's liberation in the revolution is inseparable from the liberation of the male. . . .

Jon and I have made a truce. As long as I try to combat my tendencies to remind him of his youth, he will try to combat his male chauvinism. Don't come down on me before you understand—I never said Jon was too young for anything. I just mentioned how incredible it is that in spite of a Catholic school, Georgia, etc., he refuses to allow society to entrap him in adolescence. But still, he doesn't dig any mention of age.

The night after I saw you in court, for the first (time) in months, I dreamt (or at least the dream was significant enough to work its way into my consciousness). We were together, fighting pigs, winning. We were learning to know each other.

I love you. . . .

EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR DISADVANTAGED VETERANS

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. Speaker, there are a good many who are expressing concern about the programs of the Veterans' Administration relating to disadvantaged veterans. I think these persons will be interested in the report of the Veterans' Administration which indicated that large numbers of so-called high school dropouts are taking advantage of the veterans' programs to continue their education. In this connection, I would like to insert a recent report by the Veterans' Administration on this subject.

The report follows:

EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR DISADVANTAGED VETERANS

Where are the high school drop-outs who are now Vietnam Era veterans?

During April, about 21,000 were completing high school under the GI Bill, and swelling the ranks of those who have taken advantage of a five year old Veterans Administration program that pays them monthly allowances while attending schools below the college level.

For those veterans this means enrollment in remedial or refresher courses to enable them to earn elementary or high school diplomas or otherwise qualify for higher education. This "catch-up" training is not charged against eligibility. Thus these veterans are able to save their full entitlement for higher education later on.

Veterans who are having trouble with their studies may receive special tutorial help which VA will pay for.

So far, about 66,000 educationally disadvantaged veterans have taken advantage of "catch-up" schooling or training since it became available in 1967.

However, VA pointed out that this figure does not include all assistance provided. For example, many educationally disadvantaged veterans elect to enter on-job training programs or attend vocational and trade schools.

UNITED STATES-SOVIET ARMS LIMITATION AGREEMENT MARKS A BEGINNING IN DISARMAMENT

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. Speaker, certainly we are all hopeful that the recent summit meeting in Moscow will mark the beginning of disarmament and pave the way for a lasting peace.

In this connection, I insert in the RECORD my recent newsletter Capitol Comments, because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject:

UNITED STATES-SOVIET ARMS LIMITATION AGREEMENT MARKS A BEGINNING IN DISARMAMENT

Now that President Nixon has returned from the Summit Conference in Moscow and delivered his report to the Congress in joint session, it is appropriate and timely to reflect on the significance of the highly publicized events in Moscow.

In the first place—as the President emphasized in his address before Congress—the accords signed with respect to nuclear disarmament are only a beginning. Further Strategic Arms Limitations Talks (SALT) are expected, aimed, among other things, at scaling down the numerical limitations placed on various nuclear weapons by the initial agreement. Certainly we are all hopeful that further negotiations can proceed and that there can be further progress in reduction in costs and military weapons production.

The treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the limitations of antiballistic missiles includes the following provisions:

Intercontinental ballistic missiles are limited to those under construction or deployed. The effect of this agreement is to limit ICBMs which Russia can have to 1618 in number, compared to 1054 for the United States. Officials explained that Russia was provided with an edge in missiles in the agreement because the United States has multiple warhead missiles—a single missile with a number of warheads that can be directed at different targets—while Russia has not applied multiple warheads to its missiles. In terms of warheads the United States has an estimated 5,700, while Russia has 2,500.

The United States and Russia under the agreement are permitted 200 each of antiballistic interceptor missiles—defensive missiles to knock out incoming ICBMs.

Construction of submarine-launched ballistic missiles will be frozen at current levels.

The President emphasized that "the present and planned strategic forces of the United States are without question sufficient for the maintenance of our security and the protection of our vital interests."

Other agreements signed by officials of the two nations provided for joint space exploration, for joint health and disease research, arrangements for committees to discuss environmental problems, scientific and technical cooperation, and trade; and a signal system to avoid military confrontations on the high seas.

The overall significance of the agreements is considered by some to be that the United States and Russia both appear to be working together for some stability and security in the world.

In the Congress there are reports that strong efforts will be made to reduce military expenditures because of the cutbacks and the freeze on the nuclear arsenal.

There are indications that the military weapons appropriations bill will be delayed pending an analysis of the impact of the agreement on military requirements. There exists some sentiment in the Congress that substantial cuts and reductions in the military budget can and should now be made.

Certainly we must keep our guard up and our defenses strong. There have been other agreements with Russia that amounted to little more than scraps of paper. But we are all hopeful that the President's efforts will be successful in reducing world tensions and increasing the chances for lasting world peace. Eternal vigilance must be our watchword.

HORTON PRAISES CAL STEWART AND FAIRPORT'S STEWART FIRE STATION

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, in these times when our Nation is troubled by problems which could affect our future deeply, it is essential that we recognize and pay tribute to the good that is in America. On Sunday, May 21, 1972, I saw some of the good that is America, and I gained an even greater confidence in and respect for the future of our Nation.

On that day, I attended the dedication of the new Stewart Fire Station in the village of Fairport, N.Y. Operated and maintained by the Fairport Volunteer Fire Department, this new facility was named in honor of one of the volunteer fireman, Clair "Cal" Stewart.

No simple phrase such as "one of the volunteer firemen" is an adequate way to describe Cal Stewart, a volunteer fireman since 1926 and chief of the Fairport Fire Department for 24 years. He has been a member of nearly every firefighting organization in the area, and has served as an officer of many of them.

The dedication of the fire station was an opportunity for the leaders and citizens of the community to pay a well-deserved tribute to Cal Stewart. His community and his fellow firemen have paid him their highest tribute in naming their new fire station after him.

Cal, presently serving as the Monroe County fire coordinator, shared the speaker's platform with many of the community's leaders. John J. Kenney, a fireman and long-time friend of the guest of honor was master of ceremonies and introduced the following speakers: Peter J. McDonough, Fairport's mayor; Lake B. Edwards, supervisor of the town of Perinton; Thomas Laverne, New York State Senator; and myself.

Also on the platform to pay honor to Cal Stewart were: Ivan Masclee, chief of the Fairport Fire Department; W. Robert Brown, first assistant chief; Gerald Doser, second assistant chief; Mrs. W. Robert Brown "Aileen," president of the ladies auxiliary, who presented a portrait of Cal to be displayed on the walls of the new station; Carlton E. DeWolf and Peter P. Romeo of Dewolf Associates, architects of the new station; and the Reverend Robert J. Winterkorn,

chaplain of the Monroe County Volunteer Fireman's Association.

The cochairmen of the ceremony were Ronald Jensen and Donald Fox. The building committee was staffed by Burton A. Ross, chairman; Ronald Jensen, and Gary Lewis.

During the ceremony, an American flag was given to the fire department by Mrs. Robert "Bonnie" Wiedrich, whose first husband Jeffrey D. Schumacher, Sr., lost his life in action in Vietnam in the spring of 1971. The flag was one of the two given to Bonnie, daughter of Burton Ross, by the Department of the Army at the time of the funeral. The other flag is being saved for Jeffrey D. Schumacher, Jr., to be presented to him when he is older.

The flag was accepted by Wallace D. Kennelly, president of the Fairport Fire Department while the visiting Pittsford Fire Department Band, directed by August D'Aurizio, played the National Anthem.

Stewart Station was named in honor of Cal Stewart, a man who typifies the best of what we look for in an American. He has contributed his time, energy, and talent to the community for almost 50 years in various responsibilities in the fire department. He is an individual who does not hesitate to get involved for the betterment of his community and man to be emulated by all of us.

Having been honored to be a part of the dedication ceremonies of the Stewart Fire Station, I am convinced that the spirit of community action and self-reliance—all attributes that helped to mold our great Nation—are alive and well in the village of Fairport, N.Y., and indeed in many communities like it across the country.

I commend all who made this new fire station possible, and especially Cal Stewart. On behalf of the community which he has served so diligently, I thank him.

THE BANDSTAND OF LIFE: RANNY WEEKS RETIRES

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, an unusual man is closing out an unusual career next month and some of his many friends are planning to pay him formal tribute.

The man is Ranny Weeks.

The career has ranged from leading a popular dance band through two wars in the Navy to the post of executive director of the Boston University Law School Alumni Association. He acquired an army of friends along the way and now they are going to repay his friendship.

Emanuel Goldberg has written a fine column about Ranny Weeks and his testimonial in the Jewish Times of Boston which I herewith submit.

THE BANDSTAND OF LIFE: RANNY WEEKS RETIRES

(By Emanuel Goldberg)

The human equation is an enigmatic as any of the crazy concerns that engulf man-

kind and it is rare these days to find a constant, fathomable person who does not defy accurate description: one of complete integrity, complete devotion to country, and complete confidence in the future.

Such a guy is Ranny Weeks, who in June will step down from an academic bandstand—having already done so in musical circles many years ago—and retire with his wife, Stubby, to Cape Cod.

Only his friends won't let him bow out quietly. They want him to mount the podium again, at least for the evening of Monday, June 26 when hundreds of Ranny's admirers will gather for a testimonial dinner in his honor at Sidney Hill Country Club. His friends include the noted, like co-chairmen Rudy Vallee, Arthur Fiedler, David McCord and Dr. Shields Warren, and the multitude of so-called "little people" who adore Ranny and for whom he has always had a warm greeting and genuine concern.

This writer has personally known Ranny Weeks and his family for many years, been close to him, and gratefully enriched. The difficult thing for me to swallow is that Ranny is "retiring," for the tall, handsome, ramrod-straight executive director of the Boston University Law School Alumni Association defies the ordinary mortal's erosion. His career and friendships teem with human interest, been diversified and never devious.

There were, of course, the "celebrity years" when Ranny led a famous orchestra, a role which reaped him as much income in a single week as most men then made in a year—income long gone but never, even at the titillating time, capable of turning his head. The baton, appearance and personality took him to Hollywood for a few movies (some of which he occasionally must stomach when they return via TV on the late-late shows). Ranny once confided that gossip columnists, prodded by Hollywood publicists, even tried to link him romantically with Dorothy Lamour—a family joke since Ranny's marriage to Stubby has been long and happy, and a major anchor amidst incredible pressures.

There's also the Navy side of Ranny Weeks, a very important part. He twice served as a naval officer on active duty, in World War II and during the Korean War, and for years, was a prime mover in the affairs of the active Naval Reserve Information section in Boston. There are few things he's prouder of than his Navy Captaincy, epitomizing a career that hangs on a special memory rack. Yet nobody should get the notion that Ranny is a hell-bent-for-leather militarist. It should be observed that he is a member of the Swedenborgian Society and a practising Christian, whose mystical religion keeps his steadfast gaze on the horizon and beyond.

The two wars took him out of music and back to his alma mater, Boston University, where he served for twelve years as director of Alumni Affairs. The Law School post, another labour of love for Ranny, was assumed in recent years.

Just to be sure that June 26th is not a one-night-stand, Ranny's friends, spearheaded by Newton businessman Herb Abramson, are also planning a Ranny Weeks Scholarship Fund at the B.U. Law School, which will assist needy and deserving students. Nothing could be more appropriate since Ranny's own law school study and possible legal career were abruptly terminated by a lack of funds.

A local philanthropist once described Ranny in these terms: "Ranny always stood out above the crowd." Coupled with this connotation of height in human dignity is Ranny's depth ("inner space" as he himself often referred to things). He could always write extremely well and his "Letters to the Editor" in metropolitan media still command respect. I suspect they'll revitalize at Cape Cod. Ranny comprehends instantly, and suffers long before he condemns the frailties of others. He'd rather blame himself.

STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL WORTH
OF CONGRESSMAN ROMANO L.
MAZZOLI

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, today I am placing into the RECORD a complete statement of my financial worth as of December 31, 1971. This statement includes a listing of all assets which are held in my name individually or which are held jointly with my wife, as well as all assets which are held by my wife in her individual name.

I have also included a statement of our income, from all sources, for calendar year 1971, as developed from our income tax return for that year.

I intend to place a full financial disclosure into the RECORD for each year that it is my honor to serve in the Congress of the United States.

The statement of finances is as follows:

STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL CONDITION
Romano L. and Helen D. Mazzoli,
December 31, 1971

Cash on deposit:

Lincoln Federal Savings and Loan Association, account No. 37339	\$3,196.33
Liberty National Bank & Trust Co., account No. 09-013390	6,067.30
Liberty National Bank & Trust Co., account No. 08-33-816-7	453.62
Liberty National Bank & Trust Co., account No. 08-33-817-5	100.00
American United Life Insurance Co., policy No. 1116312	65.26
American United Life Insurance Co., policy No. 1011729	459.14

Securities, Stock, and Bonds:

U.S. Government bonds, series E	722.77
---------------------------------	--------

Real Property:

Residential:	
House (Louisville): Assessed value	18,860.00
Less: Mortgage, Portland Federal Savings and Loan	12,295.03

Equity	6,564.97
--------	----------

Commercial or investment:

Household goods and miscellaneous personalty (estimated)	4,500.00
--	----------

Cash surrender value of life insurance policies:

American United Life Insurance Company, policy No. 1011729	2,100.00
--	----------

American United Life Insurance Company, policy No. 1116312	170.00
--	--------

Federal employees retirement system:

Contribution to Fund	3,097.77
----------------------	----------

Automobile:

1965 Rambler	625.00
--------------	--------

Law office furniture, equipment, and library

	772.00
--	--------

Total assets	28,894.16
--------------	-----------

INCOME FOR CALENDAR YEAR 1971

Income

Interest:	
Lincoln Federal Savings and Loan Association	\$121.59
Liberty National Bank & Trust Co.	184.82
American United Life Insurance Co.	19.32
Kentucky State Retirement System	4.69
	330.42

Law practice:

Income	2,265.00
Expenses	2,926.61
	(661.61)

U.S. House of Representatives:

Salary	38,722.00
--------	-----------

Gross income	38,390.89
--------------	-----------

Expenses

U.S. House of Representatives:	
Congressional Expenses Allowable as Deductions	8,732.73
Miscellaneous Deductions and Exemptions	5,452.99
	14,185.72

Total taxable income	24,205.17
----------------------	-----------

GREENEVILLE, TENN., HIGH SCHOOL
BAND TO TOUR EUROPE

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, this week the Greeneville High School Band and the Band Boosters Club of Greeneville, Tenn., in my district, will embark on a 2-week tour of Europe where they will visit six countries. Concerts by the band have been scheduled in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland.

I consider these fine young people and their sponsors "touring goodwill ambassadors," and I know they will do an outstanding job wherever they go.

Greeneville has a population of 15,000 and is located in beautiful east Tennessee. In the many years of growth and development of this thriving and progressive city, one of the most illustrious citizens to come out of Greeneville was Andrew Johnson, 17th President of the United States. Last month's issue of Reader's Digest recognized Andrew Johnson and cited Greeneville as being a unique, historical storehouse of the wonders of our heritage.

The article states:

Andrew Johnson's association with Greeneville is today memorialized in the Andrew Johnson National Historic Site, a tourist complex which includes a museum, a tailor shop which he operated during his early manhood, the homestead which includes the house in which he lived from 1851 until 1875, and the cemetery on Monument Hill where he was buried.

The people of Greeneville and east Tennessee take great pride in the signif-

icance of the past; however, this same citizenry glow with a feeling of delight at the present. They are especially proud of the Greeneville High School Band and the Band Boosters Club who have worked so hard to make a dream come true.

The school is fortunate to have as band director, Mr. Gene Proffitt, a native of Elizabethton in Carter County, Tenn. He has served as director in Greeneville since 1960. Mr. Proffitt received his degrees at East Tennessee State University in Johnson City and at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville.

Many honors have come to the band during Mr. Proffitt's directorship. The band has appeared locally at Armed Forces Day, Law Day, Shrine functions, political rallies, dedication exercises, and has marched in numerous parades and festivals.

The group has already traveled extensively both nationally and internationally. It represented the State of Tennessee and the Tennessee Lions Club in the 1964 Lions International Convention in Toronto, Canada; it appeared on national television at the Sugar Bowl in New Orleans; it participated in the Memphis Cotton Carnival in 1967 and again in 1969, and it has been runner-up twice in the University of Tennessee Marching Band Festival.

Much credit should also go to Danny Treadway, assistant band director, and Ralph Lister, who is currently serving as president of the Band Boosters Club. These two young men have greatly assisted Mr. Proffitt in coordinating arrangements for this trip.

Needless to say, I am extremely proud of the Greeneville High School Band and the Band Boosters Club. All 181 members of these two organizations are to be commended and I want to take this opportunity to wish each and every one of them well on this memorable journey.

The complete itinerary is as follows:

June 5, Knoxville, Tenn., to Amsterdam.
June 6, Amsterdam.
June 7, Amsterdam.
June 8, Amsterdam to Duisburg (concert).
June 9, Duisburg to Bonn.
June 10, Bonn to Seilburg (concert).
June 11, Bonn/Rhine Cruise/Rudesheim.
June 12, Rudesheim (concert—Bingen).
June 13, Rudesheim to Heidelberg.
June 14, Heidelberg to Rothenberg.
June 15, Rothenberg to Innsbruck (concert).
June 16, Innsbruck to Lucerne.
June 17, Lucerne (concert—Sursee).
June 18, Lucerne to Paris.
June 19, Paris.
June 20, Paris to Brussels to Knoxville.

CONCENTRATED EMPLOYMENT
PROGRAM FOR EX-OFFENDERS

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues information about a program

which has been initiated by the North Carolina Department of Correction for the North Piedmont Area of the State which is designed to assist prisoners who are about to be released in finding suitable and worthwhile employment. This program is called a "Concentrated Employment Program for Ex-Offenders" which provides for prerelease training of inmates, job development and placement of releasees, and followup counseling services. The businessmen in this area of North Carolina are backing this program and feel that it is working extremely well. The program, which was initiated through a grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, gives these men a chance to rehabilitate themselves and become productive members of society.

Following is a statement by Mr. Gene M. Carver, project manager which explains the project in detail, and I want to congratulate and commend Mr. Carver and all of those involved in this project for the excellent work they have done in promoting this fine program:

A STATEMENT FROM MR. GENE M. CARVER,
PROJECT MANAGER

In November, 1971 the North Carolina Department of Correction initiated an innovative correctional effort which was designed to facilitate the reintegration of ex-offenders who were returning to communities in the North Piedmont Area. The effort, a Concentrated Employment Program for the Ex-Offender, is unique, both in its focus and in its aims; furthermore, it represents a significant departure from the traditional method of returning an ex-offender to the community in which he lived prior to his incarceration.

Traditionally, an offender who was discharged from the Department of Correction received "fifteen bucks and a new suit of clothes"—that is, if he had served a sentence of two years or more. Those serving sentences of less than two years receive nothing upon release. Provided with little or no assistance upon release, the ex-offender, who has been conditioned to a state of dependency while incarcerated, is ill equipped to deal with the pressures which confront him on the "outside". Needless to say, the success rate for these releases is extremely low; 65 percent return to prison, often for committing another crime. The Concentrated Employment Program for the Ex-Offender focuses primarily on this particular group of releasees. In recognition of the importance of work as a crucial factor in the ex-offender's successful reintegration into society, the thrust of services provided by the Program is directed toward placing him on a job.

According to the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice in order to become a "fully functional adult male, one prerequisite is essential: a job". "In our society a person's occupation determines more than anything else what life he will lead and how others will regard him." The Commission's findings were supported in the report which was submitted by the President's Task Force on Prisoner Rehabilitation in April, 1970. The Task Force said that "satisfying work experience for institutionalized offenders and the assurance of decent jobs for released offenders should be at the heart of the correctional process".

Although employment is necessary for the successful rehabilitation of released offenders, a study by George A. Pownall for the U.S. Department of Labor in 1969 found that ex-offenders have more difficulty than other persons in obtaining employment. This is reflected in an unemployment rate for former

offenders that is four to five times higher than that of the public generally. In Philadelphia, for example, Pownall noted that the unemployment rate in 1969 of released prisoners was 15 percent, compared to a three percent rate for males generally in the area. For young offenders—those under 20—the unemployment figures for ex-offenders may well be even greater today than they were in 1969.

The study also revealed that even for ex-offenders who are employed, their income was less than that of the public generally, and the majority of employed releasees work in low paid unskilled or semi-skilled jobs. The national median monthly income, for example, in 1964 was \$465.58, but for employed released prisoners it was \$256.00. Even when ex-offenders work in skilled or semi-skilled jobs they receive less pay than others who work in related jobs. The national median for service workers in 1964, for example, was \$338.75, but for ex-offenders it was \$267.67; for white collar workers, the national median was \$642.21, but for ex-offenders it was \$379.57.

The Concentrated Employment Program for the Ex-Offender seeks to correct these employment inequities by providing services to offenders and ex-offenders in three crucial areas: we prepare the offender for the world of work while he is still incarcerated; we help him find employment commensurate with his ability upon his release; and, we lend the necessary assistance after he is released to ensure that he retains his job.

The pre-release assistance is essentially an orientation to the world of work which is designed to motivate the offender. The thrust of staff efforts at our Motivation Center are two-fold: we want to develop a positive attitude towards work; and, we want to expose the offender to job finding and job keeping skills which will result in easier placement for him and longer retention on the job. First, the offender is tested to measure his individual potential and identify areas of vocational interest and aptitude. After a thorough assessment of the individual has been made, the motivation cycle itself begins. Included in the four-week motivation cycle are the development of skills which include resume preparation and employment interview techniques. In addition, the offender is taught good grooming and good work habits; and, how to take advantage of training opportunities. Finally, through both individual and group counseling, the staff begins the process of resocializing the offender—a process which continues after his release.

Job development for the offender occurs while he is at the Motivation Center in order to ensure that the transition from the completion of pre-release preparation to release into the community as a full-time employee is smooth. The entire effort is closely coordinated between the Motivation Center staff and job development counselors from High Point, Winston-Salem, and Greensboro, who meet with the offender at the Motivation Center after preliminary tests have been scored and interpreted. With test results available the job developers are able to discuss more realistically and intelligently the various prospects for employment for the offender.

Given an accurate assessment of an offender's interest and potential, job developers can proceed to contact those employers who need workers with skills and aptitudes which match those of their clients. Individual attention to the employment needs of offenders eliminates the placement of carpenters in dishwashing jobs or cooks in construction work. By completing this preliminary work while the offender is still in training the job development counselor is able to provide the inmate with several job prospects when he is released.

The placement of an offender on a job marks the beginning of follow-up services. Research shows that the transition from institution to community generally is accompanied by temporary insecurity, trial and error behaviors, and especially intense feelings of hope, discouragement, frustration, and accomplishment. There are also practical, mundane problems which present themselves as well: how to get back and forth to work; and, how to survive until the first paycheck is earned for example. The same job development counselor who assisted the inmate in securing a job continues to provide support in these and related areas for as long as the two men mutually feel that the assistance is needed. The primary objectives during this time are to support the ex-offender during the initial period following release and ensure that he retains his job.

Our goal through these means—preparation for work; job development and placement; and, follow-up services—is the reduction of the high rate of recidivism of released offenders which currently is reported to be in excess of 65 percent. The achievement of our goal will contribute significantly to a reduction in crime for the area, and, in addition, will save taxpayers the expense of maintaining an offender in the State Correction System—an expense which now totals \$7.15 per day exclusive of the tax dollars for welfare support to the offender's family and the loss of productive income while he is incarcerated.

We feel that the human and practical aspects of the Concentrated Employment Program for the Ex-Offender—making productive citizens of released offenders, while helping reduce the incidence of crime and correctional costs—make it the most innovative challenge to recidivism that has been attempted anywhere in North Carolina.

THE COMMUNITY NEWSLETTER

The creation of the Concentrated Employment Program for the Ex-Offender is a manifestation of the important role the social and business communities play in corrections. In keeping with this realization, the Concentrated Employment Program for the Ex-Offender envisioned a strong need for a monthly publication to better integrate our correctional function into the communities of the North Piedmont.

This is the first edition of the Community Newsletter. Hereafter it will be published each month and will focus on the Concentrated Employment Program for the Ex-Offender and its interaction in the communities.

As Ramsey Clark stated in *Crime in America*:

"We know that corrections can rehabilitate. We know that the younger the offender the better his and society's chance. We know that when we fail it is all of us who suffer. America is a nation with the skills and resources to provide the necessary elements of rehabilitation: physical and mental health, all the education a youngster can absorb, vocational skills for the highest trade he can master, a calm and orderly environment away from anxiety and violence, living among people who care, who love—with these a boy can begin again. With these we can restore a reverence for life, a sense of security and a self-assurance amid all the pressures of modern community life. These attitudes will not be developed in a laboratory. They must be developed in the community itself: first, sometimes, in the prison community but finally in the open society in which the individual must make his way by himself."

We hope that you will contact us if you have any questions or comments about the Concentrated Employment Program for the Ex-Offender.

TERROR AT LOD—
ITS INTERNATIONAL MESSAGE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, political terrorism in the sky or on the ground against innocent civilian passengers is the most repugnant and inhumane behavior I know of. It is the kind of act that must be stopped regardless of cost, political sensitivities, inconvenience to passengers, or other obstacles.

I am speaking of the repulsive actions of three gunmen armed with automatic rifles and hand grenades, who on May 30, 1972, attacked a crowd of 300 people at Lod International Airport outside Tel Aviv, spraying them with bullets and flinging live grenades in their midst.

The floors of the airport's customs hall were splattered with the limbs of dismembered bodies and pools of blood, shattered glass, and broken doors. The walls were pockmarked with bullet holes. Some 25 people, 14 of whom were pilgrims from the United States, died in the bloodbath and 76 more were wounded. A 3-year-old girl was among the dead.

The three gunmen were leftwing Japanese terrorists trained at a Palestinian guerrilla center in Lebanon. After firing indiscriminately into the crowd, one of the gunmen shot up two parked planes, then accidentally blew himself up with a hand grenade. A second was killed by bullets fired by his comrades and the third was captured alive after unsuccessfully trying to blow up a plane.

The Marxist Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, the group which claimed credit for the massacre, said it was in retaliation for the killing of two Arab guerrillas in a hijacking earlier in May. Regardless of motive, these senseless acts of violence can serve no purpose.

All governments with airlines entering Israel must immediately take steps to insure the safety of people. This means not only searching baggage, screening people, and policing aircraft while in Israel, but also taking these steps at all points along the way. If the terrorists' baggage had been checked in Rome where the gunmen boarded an Air France airline, over 100 innocent people would not be dead or wounded today.

The Embassy of Israel has issued a policy backgrounder interpreting the international meaning of these horrendous acts. The embassy rightly states that governments and airlines must immediately take the long overdue steps necessary to guarantee the safety of airline passengers. It is not sufficient for the Rome airport officials to blame the French airline officials and the French airline officials to deny negligence. Additionally, the Arab world carries the responsibility. Cairo has allowed the terrorist organizations to freely thrive. Beirut has furnished the arms, materials, and passports.

What is left to be done is to get all governments to make the necessary security arrangements and to bring to bear on such incidents the heavy weight of world opinion. I commend to my colleagues the following background report prepared by the Embassy of Israel here in Washington:

TERROR AT LOD—ITS INTERNATIONAL MESSAGE

1. The international community has long recognized that there are categories of hostile behavior that cannot be tolerated and that, in the name of humanity and the universal interest must be outlawed. Political warfare through terror in the air against civilian carriers and passengers is clearly of this category. The carnage perpetrated at Lod International Airport by three terrorists on May 30, 1972, was an act of premeditated murder. It was an indiscriminate killing for killing's sake. Its victims were innocent civilians, men, women and children, most of them Christian pilgrims. It is not a parochial Israeli concern. It is reflective of a new and foul behavior by political extremists who take the lives of international travelers, employing as their weapon the vulnerability of mass air travel.

SECURITY NEGLIGENCE

2. Violence and murder in the air have proven to be so contagious as to constitute now a world problem. Unless checked, it threatens the very fibre of communications between states and the orderly transport of peoples and goods. Governments and airlines have it in their power to take the long overdue steps necessary to guarantee the safety of the international traveling community, on the ground and in the air. It cannot be done piecemeal as the most recent Lod tragedy so horrifically demonstrated. It is not sufficient for the Israel national airline or the Lod airport authorities to take maximum security precautions if airline and airport authorities elsewhere permit passengers to board aircraft concealing automatic rifles and grenades to murder scores of innocent people on landing in Israel. To do so is negligence bordering on the criminal. Air France, the particular airline involved in the recent Lod tragedy, is not alone, however. Similar conditions of negligence prevail at most international airports and on most carriers as the universal spread of violence in the air proves.

3. If sanity is to be restored to traffic in the air it requires the urgent and forceful action of both air carriers and governments working in concert. It requires stringent standards of security even if this inconveniences passengers. This is the minimal price for saving lives. No less important than the thorough searching of baggage and of persons, the screening of suspect individuals and the policing of aircraft in the air are steps called for on the part of the international community on the political level.

FOREIGN AGENTS

4. In the case of the murderous attack at Lod Airport on May 30, 1972, the perpetrators were three Japanese terrorists. They did not act on their own behalf. Their horrendous mission was in the service of the Beirut-based terrorist group calling itself "The Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine". Members of this group claim responsibility for previous terror acts in the air, but now they are reduced, evidently, to "liberation by proxy", employing foreign agents for their killings. Within the hour, the Popular Front issued its communique in Beirut claiming credit for the organization of the murder. Radio Cairo and the two major Cairo dailies, "Al Ahram" and "Al-Goumhouria" characterized the action as "a brilliant surprise feat" and as "the beginnings of the fedayeen uprising marking June 5".

The Fatah radio station in Syria lauded the killings in similar vein. Commented Prime Minister Golda Meir in the Knesset on May 31, 1972:

"As soon as the news of what happened broke, joy broke out in Cairo and in Beirut over the 'great victory'. Dozens of people were killed and scores of others wounded—and there is no end to the rejoicing. Those who were unable to stand up against us on the battlefields are great heroes at hiding explosives in planes, at assaults on planes and passengers, and in their readiness to blow up a plane with a hundred people aboard—as they did two years ago in the Swissair disaster. This, indeed, takes great 'courage'. And if the little 'courage' needed for that is lacking, foreigners are recruited for the purpose".

CONNIVANCE OF GOVERNMENTS

5. Arab governments carry a grave responsibility for the foul record of murder and maiming of men, women and children alluded to by Mrs. Meir in her address. Two governments share a particular blame—the Egyptian and the Lebanese. For years Cairo has given its blessing to the indiscriminate killings by the terrorist groups as an instrument of its own policies against Israel. Cairo is the location of most of the conferences of the terror organizations which are invariably greeted by President Sadat. It is a prime source of their instruction and it is the Egyptian regime that grants the major moral and political backing for their exploits.

It is from the Lebanese capital that the air terror and sabotage acts abroad mainly emanate. In Beirut are located the headquarters of the main terrorist organizations, including the Popular Front. Here the travel documents and other necessary papers are prepared, and the arms, sabotage materials and operational commands issued. Training for terrorist operations abroad are also carried out on Lebanese soil.

6. The international community has the means, were it but willing to use them, to convince such governments of the inadmissibility of their behavior. Certainly, it requires far more concrete steps than half-measures and declarations by official, international and private agencies. Tangible actions are needed including measures extending, if necessary, to abstention from the use of certain airports and airlines.

It is in the Arab capitals that the murderous plots are hatched. They have to be made to understand that their connivance in air terror warfare constitutes a crime against the world community.

TWO NECESSARY STEPS

7. Arab terror against Israel is not new. It was a phenomenon of the pre-State era, it served as the overture to the invasion of the Arab armies in 1948, and it was tried by Egypt in the 1950's and again by Syria in the early sixties. Militarily, it is of no significance, as the attempted terror campaign following the '67 war has proven. That campaign dwindled to impotence in the past two years due, not a little, to the refusal of the Arab inhabitants of the areas administered by Israel to become party to it. What is left, is the sporadic criminal acts of Arab extremists bent on killing innocent civilians for its own sake, and in hijacking aircraft to win the release of other terrorists to swell their ranks. They are international outlaws. Two major international efforts are required to eliminate them. National governments must take the drastic and cooperative steps necessary to reduce to the minimum the threat to international air passenger traffic. And Arab governments must be brought to the realization that their collaboration with air terrorism carries a too heavy international price tag.

U.S. ASSESSMENTS TO U.N.

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the House Appropriations Committee reported out the State Department appropriation bill with a unilateral reduction of our legally assessed contribution to the United Nations and its affiliated agencies. It started in motion a dangerous process which can place this country at the top of the list of nations which disregard international treaty obligations by defaulting in their payment of dues to international organizations.

On May 18, the House voted down an amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI), which would have restored the cuts made by the Appropriations Committee. Last week the Senate Appropriations Committee reported a State Department appropriations bill that would limit the U.S. contribution to 25 percent of the U.N. budget after January 1, 1973. All of these actions ignore the procedure for U.N. assessments that this country accepted when it became a member of the U.N. These actions also undermine the President's policy of obtaining a 25-percent limitation through negotiations with the U.N., a goal which might be reached by January 1, 1974.

Two recent items from the Washington Post point out the perils of these illegal unilateral actions. Both articles were written after the House vote on May 18, and both call upon the Senate to respect our international obligation to pay. Mr. Stephen M. Schwebel, in "Congress vs. International Law" expresses the hope that:

... the President of the United States will exert his full and sustained influence in favor of the United States meeting its international commitments.

We have reached the point at which the Senate vote may make the difference between honoring our obligation to pay our dues or driving the U.N. into total financial collapse this year. Full White House support for our legal obligations to the U.N. is, indeed, required.

I include Mr. Schwebel's article and the Washington Post editorial "A Meat Axe in International Affairs," both dated May 25, in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, May 24, 1972]

A MEAT AXE IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Elsewhere on this page today, Stephen M. Schwebel discusses the legal implications of last week's House vote to cut back unilaterally on U.S. financial obligations to the U.N.—an action inspired and led by Congressman Rooney of New York. The net effect of this vote—if it is upheld by the Senate—would be simple. It would reduce the United States payment from \$60.1 million to \$46.9 million. According to knowledgeable analysts, the U.N., with a full contribution from the United States, would end up on December 31 with only \$1.9 million in the bank and nothing in reserve. Operating with the diminished U.S. contribution it would run out of money sometime in the third week of October—just in the early stages of the General Assembly

meetings—with all the world watching the results of Mr. Rooney's handiwork.

And an ugly handiwork it is. The U.N. would not have money to pay salaries or expenses and would have to borrow in order to operate. But without any hope of a full contribution from the United States, there would be little likelihood that there would ever be any money to pay the loan... a position that even the kindest neighborhood finance company would find it hard to smile upon.

Thus, Mr. Rooney has treated the United Nations, our international obligations and our international credit with the same disdain he usually reserves for Directors of the United States Information Agency, Assistant Secretaries of State and Assistant Attorneys General.

When the Rooney mace is wielded in family squabbles between the legislative and the executive branches of the government, however, all that suffer are the dignity of the governmental process in this country, some important programs and the egos of some of the men the President has asked to help him do a job. But when the Rooney treatment is turned to violating our treaty obligations and will serve to humiliate the country in the eyes of the rest of the world, it becomes a bit hard to determine how this President, or any other, is going to be successful in bringing off a "generation of peace." Such a dream must encompass a notion of world order and adult behavior by all nations, particularly the one that prides itself on being the most powerful nation in the world.

Moreover, it would ill serve the cause of peace or the international standing of the United States to argue that since France and the Soviet Union began to renege first, we are justified, after the vote admitting China and the Tanzanian dance in the aisle, to behave like a pitiful helpless child, picking up our marbles and running for home. The rest of the world expects more from us and we have a right to expect more of ourselves.

Both the White House and the Department of State have protested the move. The President has stated that he believes that ultimately our aim should be to reduce our contribution to 25 per cent through orderly multilateral negotiations and the processes of the United Nations—according to our treaty commitments. That makes a great deal more sense than the Rooney meat axe.

It is to be hoped that when the bill gets to the Senate, our international obligations, the views of the President and those of the Secretary of State will be treated with the intelligence that they and our national honor deserve.

[From the Washington Post, May 25, 1972]

CONGRESS VERSUS INTERNATIONAL LAW

(By Stephen M. Schwebel)

(The writer is professor of international law at the School of Advanced International Studies of the Johns Hopkins University.)

To the apparent surprise of the State Department and the unconcealed anguish of the United Nations, Congressman John J. Rooney has extended the reach of his financial squeeze upon the International Labor Organization to embrace the whole U.N. system. A bill he has steered through the House of Representatives, if accepted by the Senate, will appropriate about \$151,000,000 to meet the American financial "obligations of membership" in the international organizations to which we belong—"Provided, that no payment shall be made . . . to the United Nations or any affiliated agency in excess of 25 percentum of the total annual assessment of such organization . . ."

The bill, in other words, recognizes that the U.S. government is bound to meet certain obligations "pursuant to treaties," but it then proceeds to set an arbitrary limit on the extent to which such obligations shall be met. As a result of this prospective 25 per

cent limitation on U.S. contributions, the House has reduced the authorized sum to be appropriated this year for the U.N. and most of its specialized agencies (the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, etc.) by some \$25,000,000.

"Much has been said and written by officials of the Executive and Legislative branches of the Government," Mr. Rooney's report declares, "relative to the necessity for reductions in our contributions to these international organizations but to date little has been accomplished. This recommended reduction serves notice that the Congress means what it has been saying in this regard." The reference in Mr. Rooney's report to what has been said and written about "the necessity" of reductions in U.S. contributions to the U.N. system is suggestive. Therein lies a story, the essentials of which are these.

A year ago, the President's Commission for the Observance of the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the United Nations (the "Lodge Commission") recommended that the U.S. affirm its intention to maintain and increase its total contributions to the U.N., but that it seek "over a period of years to reduce its current contribution of 31.52 percent to the assessed regular budget of the Organization so that eventually its share will not exceed 25 percent." As U.S. obligatory assessments decline, U.S. voluntary contributions would rise. The apparent rationale of this recommendation was to reduce somewhat the disparity between U.N. voting power and U.N. assessments—assessments based essentially on the relative capacity of members to pay.

This recommendation was one of the few of the Presidential Commission which the President took up—at least in part. In his "State of the World" message, Mr. Nixon declared that the Administration's policy would be "to negotiate with other U.N. member states" a reduction in assessments on the U.S. to the level of 25 percent. But the President cautioned: "In view of the U.N.'s current financial difficulties, and of the requirements of international law, we must proceed in an orderly way in reaching this goal. It is unrealistic to expect that it can be done immediately." The President accordingly recognized that a U.N. reduction in U.S. assessments would, in view of the "requirements of international law," have to be negotiated multilaterally, not imposed unilaterally. And he implied that the negotiation would take time—which was putting it mildly indeed.

Those familiar with the U.N. scene were aware that, in terms of political realities, U.S. assessments could only be reduced by the payment of dues of new members; that the prospective new members rich enough to pay something significant are the two Germanies, whose admission—with the ratification of the *Ostpolitik* treaties—is foreseen in 1973; and that about three quarters of their contributions would have to be earmarked for the reduction of assessments upon the United States if the percentage paid by it were to sink to 25 percent.

However, there is little reason to suppose that all other members of the U.N., or even all the developed non-Communist countries, would forego the great bulk of all the reductions to which they would be entitled by reason of the admission of the Germanies in order to please the United States. This is especially true in the face of the fact that the U.S. continues to earn more than 30 percent of the national income of the total U.N. membership. While in the next few years, the U.S. should, by reason of its normal share of the contributions which the addition of German membership should bring, benefit by a reduction in assessments to 28 to 29 percent, it is doubtful that the deftest of diplomacy could succeed in extracting 25 percent. And, if it did, the U.S. would doubtless pay more *quid* in the process than that trivial, addi-

tional U.N. *quo* of about \$6,500,000 a year would be worth.

Mr. Rooney, perhaps perceiving all this, has in any event proceeded not in what the President describes as an "orderly way", but in his own disorderly way, in contempt both of international law and the international credit of the United States. The House sustained him, as it has since 1970 in his financial assaults on the I.L.O. The I.L.O. experience, incidentally, demonstrates that the U.N. systems' vulnerability to U.S. financial irresponsibility will not be much moderated by a reduction of U.S. assessments to 25 per cent. For unlike all other U.N. agencies, the I.L.O. has traditionally assessed and today assesses the United States at 25 per cent.

The international law of the matter is beyond dispute. The U.N. Charter, and comparable clauses of the constitutions of the specialized agencies, provide that the expenses of the Organization "shall"—not "may" but "shall"—be borne by the members "as apportioned by the General Assembly" (not as apportioned by the Congress of the United States). When the extent of this obligation was argued before the International Court of Justice in its advisory proceedings on *Certain Expenses of the United Nations* the U.S. maintained that: "... the General Assembly's adoption and apportionment of the Organization's expenses create a binding international legal obligation on the part of States Members to pay their assessed shares." The Court agreed.

To be sure, the Soviet bloc, urged on by de Gaulle, stuck with France in spurning the Court's advice and the General Assembly's acceptance of it. The Assembly turned out to lack the guts to apply the Charter's mandatory provision for suspension of voting rights of financial delinquents—a decision, or lack of decision, whose vultures are now coming home to roost.

But it is not certain that, this time, the U.S. Senate will defer to Congressman Rooney's leadership of the House. Hopefully, the Senate, which has talked much of late of respect for international law, will not swallow wholesale violations of treaties to which it has given its advice and consent. And hopefully, this time, the President of the United States will exert his full and sustained influence in favor of the United States meeting its international commitments.

"THE LAST POOR MAN": ED HURLEY AUTHORS A REMARKABLE BOOK ON NEW YORK CITY POLITICS

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most provocative and powerful books on the political scene today is Ed Hurley's "The Last Poor Man." This book brilliantly describes the political realities facing those who seek elective office on the precinct level or who harbor dreams for State and national office. Mr. Hurley is a highly respected writer for the New York Daily News and for years his political observations have enlightened countless readers.

This publication is of particular importance to those of us in Queens, N.Y., because we are all familiar with Frank O'Connor's great abilities and exemplary character as a public servant. I had the distinct privilege of serving with Mr. O'Connor in the State senate and all New

Yorkers know of this fine record, as district attorney, as president of the New York City Council, and now as a State supreme court judge.

Because of the timeliness of this book and in view of the expertise of its author, I enthusiastically commend this book to those who are seeking elective office. Mr. Hurley's insights as well as his firsthand analysis of issues and political events, make this book must reading.

Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD, at this time, a brief publishers sketch of "The Last Poor Man" and its author Ed Hurley:

"THE LAST POOR MAN"

"The Last Poor Man" tunes in on television as the most powerful weapon in a modern political candidate's arsenal. The medium's enormous expense, the biggest drain on the campaign treasury, is making public office the millionaires' play toy.

Frank O'Connor, titular leader of New York State's Democratic Party, has felt this sting several times. Simply speaking, O'Connor has experienced the frustration of not being able to compete financially—commercial for commercial—with the Empire State's wealthy families in the quest for public office.

"The Last Poor Man" examines bossism, the shabby Democratic Party version and the high-tone Republican Party style. The book explores, from firsthand knowledge, the brawls of precinct politics and the lofty—and not so lofty—campaigns for high office.

The limitation of these positions of "honor and trust" to the select few millionaire dynasties can become the tragedy of our democracy. Laws regulating campaign expenditures and contributions have become shams, ignored and freely violated.

"The Last Poor Man" concludes with a breezy peek into the future and a compelling question directed at you. A question—indeed a challenge—that cannot for long be ignored.

THE AUTHOR

Ed Hurley's special view of New York politics and its colorful characters comes from opposite angles. He has witnessed major political events from the vantage point of the press section.

Hurley has also sat in council in the famous smoke-filled rooms of the Regular and Reform Democrats. He has visited their Republican counterparts in posh, air-conditioned splendor. A privilege not granted to many, especially newspapermen.

Hurley's political columns and special features for the New York *Daily News* have been saluted throughout the Empire State.

The author has campaigned in the election districts of New York City's five boroughs and toured the country in Air Force One with President John F. Kennedy. Hurley campaigned for JFK in 1962 "before it became fashionable." He has also worked in the political ventures of Bob Kennedy, Adlai Stevenson, Bob Wagner and a score of congressional figures.

GUN CONTROL

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we all agree something should be done to solve the great problem of preventing deranged people and criminals in the commission of crimes from getting hold of guns.

The attempt to assassinate Gov. George C. Wallace of Alabama has revived talk of enacting additional Federal firearms controls. While new means of handling this problem must be explored, more than ever we must approach each recommended solution with careful study and restraint to prevent the enactment of confiscatory legislation which, if enacted in haste and under the pressure of hysteria, could well cause more harm than good to the general public we would be trying to protect.

Governor Wallace was shot and wounded by a supposedly demented man who trailed him through a half dozen States by automobile before firing a shot from a pistol. There has been no talk about setting up better mental health facilities or detection techniques to identify the mentally disturbed. There has been no talk of enacting more stringent laws against the use of firearms in the commission of a felony or even the use of motor vehicles to perpetrate a crime, nor have the courts vigorously applied laws enacted in 1970 by the Congress which require certain mandatory sentences of persons convicted of a felony where a firearm was involved. All of these factors, it would appear upon cool consideration, are fully as important as any rush to legislate against handguns and perhaps even more so.

The present administration has consistently taken the position that gun control is essentially a matter of State regulation. This is logical under the long-standing theory of law that the police power is reserved to the individual States, because a law which is good for one State may not be good for another. Insofar as gun laws are concerned, the Federal Government should at most back up the States, where possible in such a way as to enable them to enforce their own laws which are best fitted to their own conditions. This is a traditional realistic American way of thinking.

It should be of interest to Virginians and to the rest of the Nation that the suspect in the Wallace shooting committed the crime exactly 7 weeks to the day after a new, restrictive Maryland handgun control law took effect. That law would have been sufficient to stop him in advance if anyone had sought to invoke it. Unfortunately, no one did, although the suspect had been under surveillance by law enforcement officers repeatedly during the weeks preceding the Wallace shooting. Under the "stop and frisk" provision of the Maryland law, officers could have searched the suspect at any time if his conduct or appearance caused them to believe that he was carrying a firearm with unlawful intent.

The new Maryland law is in fact one of the strongest in the Nation. It is as strong, if not stronger, than any Federal firearms law which has a possibility of enactment and application under such circumstances. How can there be any law much stronger than one which permits citizens to be searched on mere police suspicion? There was indeed opposition to the Maryland law on grounds that it was too strong in this respect and tended to violate civil liberties.

Some say the answer to this problem

is to confiscate all guns. However, I have serious problems with this proposition for several reasons. One will suffice: Law-abiding American citizens are not in any mood to surrender their firearms meekly in these troubled times, to anyone on any pretext.

All probable information indicates that a majority of the families in the United States own one or more firearms, sometimes as many as a dozen or more. It is estimated that there are approximately 50 million privately owned handguns, alone, in the United States. The vast majority of these are owned by good, law-abiding citizens. It might well be unconstitutional to deprive them of their property without due process. It might well impinge on their constitutional rights to protect themselves, their dear ones and their property against criminal hoodlumism which has been so rampant in recent years, not to mention the entirely proper "pursuit of happiness" which takes more than 20 million hunters afield every year for the sake of sport.

It is no mere catch-phrase to say that any law attempting to confiscate private firearms in the United States is likely to leave the inevitable residue of guns mostly in the hands of criminals and others who make a habit of failing to comply with laws. Homicide and other crime would still exist, under those circumstances, and conceivably could increase.

The problem of attacks on public figures is a very real and acute one, and Governor Wallace has the deep and sincere sympathy of all good Americans. Yet, if there is a solution to such attacks, it must be far more comprehensive than merely outlawing certain types of guns or even prohibiting all private firearms ownership.

Whether there is any way to assist the mentally disturbed and alleviate the threat that comes from a few of them is a huge question in itself. Certainly some answers can be found. Whether there is any way to curb the use of firearms in crime, when even children have manufactured the "zip-gun" from pieces of ordinary pipe, is a problem awaiting solution. I personally feel that one of the best solutions is vigorous enforcement of the Federal law requiring mandatory sentencing of those using a gun in the commission of a crime. Unfortunately the courts have so far been reluctant to forcefully apply this law. Nonetheless, to approach only one phase of the immediate situation by hastily passed gun control legislation is no real approach at all. It is political sophistry and should be recognized and opposed as such.

Finally, it should be said that no one legislative stroke is going to cause this problem to dry up and blow away. It is a problem, however, that needs solving and one which I intend to fully pursue.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks:

"How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

CARROLL M. CRAFT RETIRES— ALASKA STATE OFFICIAL

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, on July 15, 1972, Mr. Carroll M. "Murph" Craft will retire as the Alaska State Director of Vocational Rehabilitation after 11 years of dedicated service to Alaska and 14½ years in the rehabilitation field.

Four years ago, Mr. Craft went before the Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation with the suggestion that they establish a minimum allotment of \$1 million in funds to the States for the basic support program for vocational rehabilitation services. At that time, the Council of State Administrators made this proposal part of their program and took it before the National Rehabilitation Association. This association also accepted the proposal and this minimum allotment of \$1 million was made a part of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

About 2 years ago, Mr. Craft evaluated the program and found that the \$1 million minimum was inadequate for the less populous States which have a higher per capita income, such as Alaska. He, again, went to the Council of State Administrators and to the National Rehabilitation Association for approval of his proposal that a \$2 million minimum be set.

Recent legislation (H.R. 8395) was passed by the House of Representatives which recognizes Mr. Craft's foresight. The committee, in title I, section 103, has gone even further and added a provision that—

The minimum available to each State will be \$2 million or ¼ of 1 percent of the amount appropriated, whichever is greater.

This action was taken in recognition of the fact that—

A certain minimum level of funding is necessary to conduct an adequate program in any State, but once that minimum is achieved, the minimum should be allowed to expand in relation to the total amount of funds available for matching.

Mr. Craft has been a loyal, dedicated worker in the field of rehabilitation for many years and has felt a professional obligation to help to make the rehabilitation system the best possible program available. He has been active and concerned about the services provided for physically and mentally handicapped persons, and it was with this in mind that he sought to have the basic level of funding raised for less populous States. Because of his outstanding efforts, the handicapped people of Alaska, Delaware, Nevada, and Wyoming will be able to receive basic services to help to prepare

them for employment and a productive, useful life. The House report to accompany H.R. 8395 defines these basic services as:

- (1) comprehensive evaluation, including medical study and diagnosis;
- (2) medical, surgical, and hospital care, and related therapy to remove or reduce disability;
- (3) prosthetic and orthopedic devices;
- (4) counseling or reduce disability;
- (5) training services;
- (6) services in comprehensive or specialized rehabilitation facilities, including adjustment centers;
- (7) maintenance and transportation as appropriate during rehabilitation;
- (8) tools, equipment, and licenses for work on a job or in establishing a small business;
- (9) initial stock and supplies, and management services and supervision, for small businesses including the acquisition of vending stands by the State agency;
- (10) reader services for the blind and interpreter services for the deaf;
- (11) recruitment and training services to provide new careers for handicapped people in the field of rehabilitation and other public service areas;
- (12) the construction or establishment of rehabilitation facilities;
- (13) the provision of facilities and services which promise to contribute to a group of handicapped people, but which do not relate directly to the rehabilitation plan of any one individual;
- (14) services to families of handicapped people when such services will contribute substantially to the rehabilitation of the handicapped client;
- (15) placement services, including follow-up services, to assist handicapped individuals to secure and maintain their employment; and
- (16) other goods and services necessary to render a handicapped person employable.

The purpose of the vocational rehabilitation program is to combine all resources in a coordinated way, to bring the disabled or handicapped person to the best functioning level.

The field of rehabilitation will miss "Murph" Craft when he retires on July 15, but the progress he has brought about through his innovative ideas and his genuine concern for the physically and mentally handicapped people of this Nation will be a rich reward for his years of outstanding service. On behalf of all Americans, I want to express our gratitude for Mr. Craft's exceptional achievements in the field of vocational rehabilitation.

HUNGER STRIKE COMMENCED BY NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS TO PROTEST WAR

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, more and more people around the country are feeling the frustration of watching the President, who was elected on his pledge to end the war in Southeast Asia, continually escalate the level of American involvement through increased air attacks and most recently by mining Haiphong Harbor.

The American people want to get out of Vietnam. The Vietnamese people want us out. And yet we stay, seeking a mili-

tary victory while proclaiming a desire for peace.

Inevitably, Americans come to wonder what difference they can make, when their President acts like an absolute monarch and Congress sits on its hands.

In an effort to express their frustration, to express their opposition to the policies being pursued by the President, 203 students at Northwestern University in Evanston, Ill., committed themselves to a hunger strike. They have asked other Americans who share their strong feelings to join them in this expression of opposition and of personal commitment.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray that such hunger strikes need not last too much longer. The conscience of the Nation cannot starve for much longer and still remain alive.

NATIONAL BLOOD BANK ACT OF 1972

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I have sponsored legislation to deal forcefully with the purity and safety of the Nation's blood supply. The National Blood Bank Act of 1972, authored by our colleague from California (Mr. Veysey) would establish a Federal program to encourage voluntary blood donation and require that all blood banks be licensed and inspected by the Federal Government.

These steps would drastically reduce the incidence of serum hepatitis by getting at the primary source of this insidious disease: the paid blood donor. There is ample evidence that the risk of contracting hepatitis from the blood of paid donors is far greater than the risk from blood donated voluntarily. I understand the risk estimates range from at least 11 times greater to as high as 70 times greater. According to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Center for Disease Control—CDC—52,583 cases of serum hepatitis were reported in 1970 alone. Given these statistics, it is alarming to think that only seven States license blood banks and only five inspect them. The Federal Government has been equally negligent.

The dangers of bad blood have come all too close to home for me. Recently, one of my closest friends suffered a serious coronary attack and had to undergo a major heart operation. Little did he know that the routine transfusions he required would prove as risky as this most delicate surgery. He contracted serum hepatitis from contaminated blood.

My friend survived, but one out of every 150 transfusion patients over age 40 does not. Dr. J. Garrott Allen, probably the Nation's most eminent expert on the blood problem, has estimated 3,500 deaths and 50,000 illnesses a year from serum hepatitis. Because so many serum hepatitis cases go unreported by physicians,

the CDC says the rate could be 2 to 10 times Dr. Allen's estimate.

The National Blood Bank Act of 1972 should not be interpreted as a condemnation of all blood bank operations. On the contrary, it seeks, in a responsible manner, to require disreputable operators to adhere to the same standards followed by conscientious blood banks in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we are indebted to our colleague, Mr. VEYSEY, for introducing legislation that hopefully will lead to congressional scrutiny of blood banking. I urge our committee to move on this legislation before we run out of time in this Congress.

DAYLIN, INC. HONORS THE FUND FOR HIGHER EDUCATION—IN ISRAEL

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, an American company which has concerned itself with matters of social responsibility for most of its corporate life has undertaken a unique project which I wish to call to the attention of the House.

The company, Daylin, Inc., with headquarters in my district in Beverly Hills, Calif., has operations in the retail business throughout the United States. This forward-looking company has lent its name and prestige to the Fund for Higher Education—in Israel—to support a tri-university dinner which will be held on June 25, 1972, at the Beverly Hilton Hotel in Beverly Hills.

The uniqueness of this undertaking is that it will raise funds for projects at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles, Brandeis University in Waltham, Mass., and Tel Aviv University in Tel Aviv, Israel. To the best of my recollection this is the first time in the history of academic fundraising that an effort has been made simultaneously on behalf of more than one university at a single function.

But then, the Fund for Higher Education—in Israel—stands out as different in other important ways. Although it has that parenthetical phrase "in Israel" as part of its very name, the fund aims its philanthropy not only at America's staunch ally in the Middle East, the State of Israel, but also at American institutions as well.

For lending their efforts to the fundraising activities for this educationally enriching purpose, a distinguished group of Daylin executives are being honored, one of them posthumously.

The Fund for Higher Education—in Israel—will establish the Peter Lum Lounge to serve students and faculty at the new pharmaceutical science center at the University of Southern California. Peter Lum was the first pharmacist hired by Daylin. The son of Chinese immigrants, he had grown with the company to become the first man to hold the posi-

tion of vice president of Daylin. He died in a tragic airplane crash in 1965, but his orphaned daughter, Helene Louise Lum, will attend the Los Angeles dinner to accept for him the Maimonides Laurel of the Fund for Higher Education—in Israel.

Also to be honored with him, and to receive the Maimonides Laurel, will be four senior executives, all pharmacists who worked with Peter Lum. They are Gary E. Parks, corporate vice president; Sol Goldsmith, president of Hospital Pharmacies, Inc.; Harold Heldfond, president of Daylin Medical & Surgical, Inc.; and Francois D. "Bo" Studer, president of Studer Wholesale Drugs.

In addition, a memorial plaque at the Peter Lum Lounge when completed will carry the names of the Daylin founders who planned the memorial, Amnon Barness, chairman of the board; Max Candiotti, president; and Dave Finkle, chairman of the executive committee. The plaque will list a total of some 75 friends and associates of Peter Lum still active with Daylin.

Brandeis University will be the recipient of funds to establish the Yearbook Room in the Student Union Building at the university. The room will be named for Alvin M. Levin, Secretary of Daylin, Inc. who will also receive the Maimonides Award.

Establishment of the George and Dorothea Swerdlow Mathematics Building in the Center for Theoretical Studies at Tel Aviv University will be the third result of the June 25 dinner. George Swerdlow is president of Western Big Wheel, a Daylin company, engaged in sale of automotive supplies through discount stores. Mr. Swerdlow and his wife, Dorothea, have been very active and their philanthropic gifts have helped many enterprises. Mr. Swerdlow will receive the Flame of Truth Award.

The Fund for Higher Education—in Israel—which was first launched some 18 months ago, now has under construction five buildings in Israel has commitments for the three others to which I have referred, as well as a fourth project soon to get underway, the Georges A. Hanzi Experimental Surgery Institute at Tel Hashomer Hospital, affiliated with Tel Aviv University.

The fund received its impetus from the founders of Daylin and has attracted a prestigious board of advisers which includes Dr. Albert B. Sabin, discoverer of the Sabin oral polio vaccine and head of the Weizmann Institute of Science; Alexander Goldberg, president of Technion; Prof. William Haber, adviser to the executive officers of the University of Michigan; Dr. Joseph J. Schwartz, renowned American Jewish communal leader and scholar; Dr. George S. Wise, chancellor of Tel Aviv University; and the Honorable Aviad Yafeh, member of the Knesset, Israel's parliament.

Daylin, Inc., its founders—Messrs. Barness, Candiotti, and Finkle—and the Fund for Higher Education—in Israel—are to be commended for their foresight, their philanthropic efforts and goals. They are a credit to American ingenuity and enterprise.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS PRESENTS THE BLACK DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE AND THE BLACK BILL OF RIGHTS

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, 1972, the Congressional Black Caucus announced its preparation of the black declaration of independence and the black bill of rights. It was an historic moment and one which, we hope, will have positive repercussions throughout the American political system.

The preamble to the black declaration of independence states:

The Congressional Black Caucus calls on the National Democratic Party, as the Party whose victories have always depended upon black votes, to take immediate steps to rectify the harsh conditions under which black citizens are forced to live.

We feel that the Democratic Party would take long strides toward this goal by adopting our minimum demands, as set forth in the 12 articles of the black bill of rights.

The black bill of rights' articles concern jobs and income; foreign policy; education; housing and urban problems; health; minority enterprise; drugs; penal reform; Democratic administration appointments; justice and civil rights; self-determination for the District of Columbia; and the military.

This document was prepared and will be presented to the National Democratic Party, at the request of the millions of poor, disadvantaged, and minority Americans who look to the Congressional Black Caucus for leadership. It was compiled after a year of intense hearings, meetings and conferences with hundreds of thousands of our nationwide constituency.

I urge my colleagues in this Chamber to review this document which we hope will have the strong support of every Democratic Member of this body and that you will join with us in this endeavor to enrich the quality of life for all Americans.

The preamble, declaration, and bill of rights follow:

PREAMBLE TO THE BLACK DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE AND THE BLACK BILL OF RIGHTS

Millions of black Americans look to the 13 black Members of the United States House of Representatives as their legitimate spokesmen on national issues. Members of the Congressional Black Caucus are petitioned daily by citizens, living hundreds of miles from our Congressional Districts, who view us as Congressmen-at-large for Black America. This imposes an awesome burden on our shoulders. Large numbers of Black Americans have been subjected to intense hardships, have been denied their basic rights, and have suffered irreparable harm because the two major political parties have failed to firmly and honestly commit their powers and resources to equality and justice for all.

It has become patently obvious to the Members of the Congressional Black Caucus that black Americans will no longer tolerate insensitivity and lack of concern on the part

of those who benefit from black involvement in the political process. Therefore, the Congressional Black Caucus calls on the National Democratic Party, as the Party whose victories have always depended upon black votes, to take immediate steps to rectify the harsh conditions under which black citizens are forced to live.

The new political mood permeating Black America makes it impressive that the Democratic Party address itself to the hopes, aspirations, concerns and rights of black Americans—if that Party expects to continue to receive the support of black voters. Benevolence and paternalism are unacceptable and will not be tolerated. The torch has passed to a new generation of blacks who no longer accommodate but confront; who no longer plead but demand; who no longer submit but fight.

THE BLACK DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

"We have no permanent friends, no permanent enemies—just permanent interests."—Rep. William "Bill" Clay.

We, the Members of the Congressional Black Caucus, being the highest elected black officials in the United States, responding to a mandate from millions of black Americans, and in conjunction with thousands of representatives from our national constituency, do hereby demand that the following Black Bill of Rights be implemented immediately, to create a society which is truly founded upon the principles of freedom, justice, and full equality.

We insist that the Democratic Party, in its official pronouncements and policies, and at its national political convention, dedicate itself to the doctrine that no American shall be denied the fundamental right to be equal.

Black Americans are no longer petitioning for equal treatment, but are demanding from the Democratic Party and its Presidential nominee a full, honest and unequivocal commitment to equality—in words, deeds, and most importantly, results.

If Black Americans are to achieve equality in this country, the Democratic Party must create the machinery to realize and to implement the Black Bill of Rights.

THE BLACK BILL OF RIGHTS

"It's not the man it's the plan;
It's not the rap it's the map"—Ossie Davis.

I. JOBS AND INCOME

If the right to live is to be assured for blacks and other citizens, the new Democratic Administration must establish a full employment program and replace the present welfare system with a guaranteed annual income system.

A. Full Employment

The number one priority, in our view, is the creation of jobs to alter the present imbalance in the national unemployment rate. While the national unemployment average is about 6%, Black unemployment is an intolerable 10.6%. Joblessness among Black youth has soared to 44%. Furthermore, in some cities Black unemployment reaches the shocking level of 45%. These stark statistics represent millions of struggling Americans who seek employment and do not find it, who want to earn a living and are denied the opportunity. Confronting what is truly a national crisis, the Congressional Black Caucus calls for:

(1) The establishment of a national monetary and fiscal policy designed to achieve continuous full employment and full production.

(2) A direct attack on the high unemployment among minority groups and in minority communities, through public service job programs, training programs, quality education and a computerized comprehensive national employment service.

(3) A systematic approach to solving the apparent tendency of full employment to

cause inflation. This would include more effective enforcement of the anti-trust laws, a comprehensive program of consumer education, and Federal product testing and quality rating.

B. Guaranteed annual income

By now it is almost commonplace, if not cliché, to state that the present welfare system is inadequate and inequitable. We urge that:

(1) The present system be replaced by a guaranteed annual income system.

(2) The Democratic Party oppose any welfare "reform" program which fails to establish a one-year timetable for reaching a guaranteed adequate income system of a minimum of \$6,500 a year for a family of four.

(3) The Democratic Party oppose any punitive "workfare" requirement legislation.

II. FOREIGN POLICY

Black Americans, like all Americans, have a right to peace. If our right to peace and the right of black people on the continent of Africa to freedom and oppression are to be realized, the New Democratic Administration must bring an immediate and definite end to the war in Indochina and withdraw all support of colonialist or neo-colonialist forces on the continent of Africa.

A. End the war

The New Democratic Administration must terminate all military activities in Southeast Asia immediately, concomitant with an immediate withdrawal of all American land, sea and air forces.

B. Support African liberation

Implementation of a New Democratic Administration Foreign Policy of support for the liberation of black people of Africa should be reflected in:

(1) An increase in American aid to black African nations from 8.5 of our foreign aid to 20% for a period of five years.

(2) An immediate halt to the purchase of chromium ore from Southern Rhodesia.

(3) The immediate transfer of our sugar quota arrangement from the Republic of South Africa to a majority-ruled state in South Africa.

(4) The withdrawal of all support from Portugal in terms of loans and grants and as a member of NATO.

(5) The withdrawal of all economic or political support from Africa countries that practice suppression and perpetuate inequality and apartheid.

(6) The discouragement of private American investment in South Africa and the closing of all U.S. government financed or contracted facilities, including the U.S. Embassy in the Republic of South Africa.

III. EDUCATION

The right to a quality education is as fundamental as any in the Bill of Rights. America can afford every child a quality education. To finance quality education for all, we urge the inclusion of specific tax reform recommendations in the Democratic Party Platform so that the cost of education will not continually be borne by the poor. The Party's commitment to quality education for blacks and other disadvantaged minorities should reflect itself in platform planks calling for:

A. Increased appropriations under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

B. Increased funds for research and development in the areas of education for minorities.

C. Increased federal funds for black institutions of higher education.

D. Increased funds for aid to students and for community colleges.

E. The development of mechanisms for black control of schools where black children are educated, moving beyond the sterile issue of "busing" to the basic issue of the

redistribution of educational wealth and control.

F. Federal, state and local authorities to comply fully with the Supreme Court's recent school desegregation decision that busing will be employed as a suitable means to ensure quality education for all American children.

IV. HOUSING AND URBAN PROBLEMS

The right of every American to live in human decency must not be abridged by federal passiveness. Citizens of the inner-city, especially blacks, are confronted with increasingly deteriorating housing conditions. To remedy the current situations, we urge that your platform include a plank calling for:

A. A new Homestead Act, to make use of the billions of dollars worth of land now owned by federal, state, and local governments. This property must not move into the hands of private, for-profit developers when there is such drastic need for human housing and land use where black people live.

B. The rebuilding of the inner cities—not the removal of the poor.

C. Tax legislation which would provide priority treatment for investments in new and rehabilitated housing in the inner-city.

D. Free access by minority groups to housing in any community or building in the land.

V. HEALTH

A major plank of any national platform must be guaranteed health delivery systems. The current inaccessibility of adequate health delivery to all Americans; lack of adequate or comprehensive health coverage, and seemingly uncontrollable rises in health cost combine to relegate countless Americans to a state of insufficient medical care. To remedy this, we urge:

A. The establishment of a National Health Insurance for all citizens from birth until death, with free medical care for all the poor and near-poor.

B. A federal program to recruit and train minority medical and para-medical personnel.

C. The establishment of a national health delivery system which encompasses those existing programs similar to the Neighborhood Health Centers (NHC) which are functioning well in a limited role with a delivery mechanism that provides physician's in-patient and out-patient hospital emergency services, out-of-area emergency service preventive health care, home health services, laboratory and radiological services and laboratory services included, and physical therapy. The concept of comprehensive health services should include the following areas: psychological, sociological, and environmental, as well as physiological.

D. That there be outreach services which attack the problems of health, education and health awareness in the community.

E. Health centers should be provided in a coordinated, continuous and comprehensive manner so that the services are available and accessible to the communities being served.

F. The establishment of state and national peer review programs for the medical profession.

G. That the schools of the health sciences at both Meharry and Howard University be expanded immediately to their maximum capacity and that, further, priority funding be given to any new schools of the health sciences which focus on increasing the number of minority members in the health field.

H. The establishment of a limit on profits which can be made on the sale of drugs.

VI. MINORITY ENTERPRISE

Business ownership and receipts reveal a wide economic disparity between blacks and whites in this country. For example, in a total of 7.3 million businesses, approximately 170,000, or slightly over 2%, are black owned. Blacks constitute over 12% of the popula-

tion. These black businesses had sales of only 4.5 billion dollars; white businesses had gross sales of 1.5 trillion dollars. Black-owned banks and insurance companies owned less than one billion dollars in assets.

To correct the present inequities and to fulfill the right of black Americans to the free enterprise system, we urge that your platform include:

A. A call for an increase in the number of black-owned businesses with supporting grants and loans from the federal government and major corporations.

B. The establishment of a federal policy to set aside 15% of all government contracts exclusively for black-owned businesses.

C. Provisions whereby all government funds earmarked to be expended in black areas be deposited in and disbursed by black banks.

VII. DRUGS

Black Americans have a right to drug-free lives and drug-free communities.

The goal of the Democratic Party must be to eliminate the illegal sale and use of drugs and to treat those who are unfortunately hooked on drugs not as criminals but as people with serious health problems. To accomplish this we urge the inclusion in your platform of a plank that:

A. Declares drug abuse and addiction a major national crisis.

B. Require the use of all existing resources to stop the illegal entry of drugs into the United States, including suspension of economic and military assistance to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs produced or processed in that country from entering the United States unlawfully.

C. Make funds available to every major city for the establishment of ambulatory detoxification and rehabilitation centers.

D. Provides federal financial support through a locally controlled board to reinforce the local initiatives.

E. Provides for efforts to develop non-addictive, safe and effective substances to prevent, treat, and cure addiction. Methadone is a highly addictive, dangerous and frequently abused drug. Methadone is no cure-all for the problems of drugs. Methadone maintenance programs, and recently proposed heroin maintenance programs, should only be used with a full recognition of their limitations and with a commitment to develop alternative therapies.

VIII. PENAL REFORM

The tragedy at Attica has catapulted into national prominence the brutal fact that most of our penal institutions are out-dated, inhumane, dehumanizing and extremely cruel. The new Democratic Administration must act swiftly and decisively to implement enlightened methods of dealing with people who run afoul of the law—methods that view the time spent in prison not merely as punishment, but as an alternative factor in the re-socialization of a human being.

The Democratic Party's commitment to thorough-going penal reform should reflect itself in a plank that includes:

A. The establishment of reliable vehicles for the enunciation and redress of prisoner grievances.

B. The establishment of meaningful training programs, both educational and vocational, which are complemented by work release and educational release programs, remuneration for all work performed and job placement assistance upon release.

C. The systematic inclusion of such aids to rehabilitation as halfway houses for men, home furloughs for married men and women, privacy, as relates both to correspondence and family visitations and to the full restoration of civil rights including the right to vote upon completion of a sentence.

D. An end to the practice of incarcerating individuals for their political beliefs and in-

tolerance of religious beliefs, particularly as they relate to dietary laws.

E. The revamping of first offender programs, methods of bail release, and parole and probation systems so as to encourage and assist the prison resident in readapting to society.

F. The construction of small, modern facilities by the federal government in proximity to the large urban areas and the recruitment of minority personnel for prison employment.

IX. DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATION APPOINTMENTS

Though black Americans make up 20% of the Democratic Party electorate, the blackman's right to their share of the power in a Democratic Administration has been woefully neglected by the party in the past. This must stop. The Democratic National Platform must call for black Americans receiving a proportionate amount of all appointed positions, up to and including the Cabinet of the President of the United States. Furthermore, federal judgeships shall reflect the percentage of minority residents in any given state or local jurisdiction. In this policy's enactment, particular attention shall be paid to correct the racial imbalance which exists in the Southern federal judiciary.

X. JUSTICE AND CIVIL RIGHTS

Earlier this year the Congressional Black Caucus responded to the Administration's report on "Progress in Civil Rights". Our paper, entitled "From the Administration Which Gave Us Benign Neglect", scored the Administration's insincerity and hypocrisy on the subject of civil liberties and equal rights.

One critical area which we discussed at the time remains critical today—voting rights. The Democratic National Platform and the new Administration should move to:

A. Establish political guarantees that regional and metropolitan government arrangements do not disenfranchise or deny majority black cities and blacks in other jurisdictions the right of self-government, self-determination and control of their communities and of federal and state resources provided within metropolitan areas.

B. Effect the strict application of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 so that those currently disenfranchised will be able to participate in the upcoming election.

C. Increase the number of black federal judges and other legal officials, including U.S. Attorneys, U.S. Marshalls, federal correctional officers and other Justice Department employees in every region of the country.

XI. SELF-DETERMINATION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

No Black Bill of Rights would be complete that did not call for the granting of self government to the nearly 800,000 residents of our Nation's Capitol, 72% of whom are black.

The National Democratic Platform should contain a firm commitment to the "Washington agenda" brought to Miami Beach by the duly elected District of Columbia Delegation to the Democratic Convention, which agenda is also an integral part of the National Black Political Agenda.

The agenda calls for full congressional representation, an elected mayor and city council with an automatic federal payment formula and a host of interim and immediate steps that the President and the Congress must take to deal with the social, economic and political problems confronting the people of this, the Last Colony.

XII. THE MILITARY

It is the RIGHT of every Serviceman and Servicewoman to be FREE from discrimination within the military system. Certainly this nation cannot be secure as long as its forces are more concerned with protecting themselves against their fellow servicemen than they are with fighting the external

enemy. Although blacks make up to 10.8% of the military personnel, they are not permitted equal representation as officers; they receive a higher percentage of other than honorable discharges; and they are assigned to more menial occupational jobs.

The New Democratic Administration must deal with this reality and turn from lip service which condemns discrimination in our society to proposing concrete programs of reform.

We urge the creation of a Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civil Rights who would have direct access to the Secretary of Defense as well as to the Secretary of each branch of service.

We urge a complete revision of the Uniform Code of Military Justice that would remove the judicial system from the military and transfer it to the civilian federal courts.

We urge the establishment of an independent non-judicial appeal procedure outside of the military chain of command.

We urge the elimination of all punitive discharges and the establishment of a certificate of service that would in effect remove the distinction of "honorable, dishonorable, undesirable", etc.

GENERAL CLARKE SPEAKS OUT FOR SOLDIERS IN RIOT SITUATIONS

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a soldier of distinction, Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, USA, retired, is well aware of the problems facing our college campuses and our cities in recent years of protests and riots. General Clarke, however, is also concerned with the soldier's role in a riot situation. This outstanding soldier has expertise and experience that, I am sure, would be of great benefit and interest to this body. In the interest of explaining a soldier's duty, and a soldier's predicament in the riots for which they must defend people and property, I insert these remarks by General Clarke in the RECORD:

THE CASE FOR THE SOLDIER CALLED OUT TO QUELL A DOMESTIC DISTURBANCE

(By Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, USA, Retired)

(EDITOR'S NOTE: General Clarke was an enlisted man in the National Guard in 1920-21. He was on the staff of Army Ground Forces in 1945-48, and was Commanding General of CONARC in 1958-60. Thus he has given much thought to the problems of employing troops to quell civil disturbances.)

In the early days of our existence as a nation we found that the Articles of Confederation were ineffective in providing the kind of Federal Government we needed. A Constitutional Convention was called. Its first order of business was to set down what services the people wanted the Federal Government to provide the citizens of our nation.

This became the Preamble to the Constitution of the United States of America. Substantially, it set forth the following in one sentence:

"We the People of the United States in order to: Form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

All six of these requirements for an ade-

quate Federal Government were to be the products of a Government of laws functioning in an environment of law and order. The framers of our constitution considered that the orderly processes of a Government of laws could only exist in a climate of domestic tranquility. Thus they used the phrase: "insure domestic tranquility," not "restore domestic tranquility."

Is there anyone in the field of higher education who hasn't had reasons to be concerned with this subject in the past few years of campus demonstrations and disorders? Might it not be well for them to learn more, not only about the nature of riots and rioters, but about the young men, pursuant to orders, who may be confronted with the unpleasant duty of insuring or restoring "domestic tranquility"?

When we think of what is the cause of a breakdown of domestic tranquility in a community, a riot comes to mind. What is a riot? Riot is a legal term defined as follows:

"A tumultuous disturbance of the peace by 3 persons or more assembling together of their own authority with the intent mutually to assist each other against any who shall oppose them in the execution of some enterprise of a private nature and actually executing the same in a violent and turbulent manner to the terror of the people whether the act intended were of itself lawful or unlawful."—Black's Law Dictionary, 3rd Edition.

Sometimes our Commander in Chief or our Governors of the several states call out a military force to insure domestic tranquility when a riot threatens but, often, they do not do so until the situation is out of hand and a riot has started and then the job of the troops is to restore domestic tranquility. The latter case confronts the young trooper with the more difficult mental, physical and disciplinary situation.

Let us now consider the young soldier, his leaders, his training, his opponents, his weapons, their weapons, their mental and emotional state, how to perform his task with the least injury to people and property and to himself. All of these factors must be considered in the framework of the morale, training and disciplinary veneer of the troops who are engaged under legal orders in a confrontation with their own people on a task they do not like and from which they will receive little credit and probably much mental and possibly physical abuse.

Here are a few thoughts on the problem of handling riots by soldiers:

1. People who engage in a riot are disorganized and emotional, and basically cowardly as a group. The crowd lacks unity and courage.

2. If we are going to handle them without bloodshed we must use enough force (or show enough force) to cause them to believe the riot has no chance of success.

3. A policy of "limited" or "graduated" response by police or troops can only encourage the rioters and lead to bloodshed.

4. The ones who egg on the rioters are almost never in front. They operate from a safe position in the rear.

5. The best trained soldiers have a "breaking point" when on such duty. Even though soldiers likely to be employed in riot duty are periodically given training the turnover of personnel is such that their training is seldom at full effectiveness when used on short notice.

6. Young soldiers can take only so much abuse, rocks, insults and casualties before their veneer of discipline and commander-control wears thin—then they break under actual or feared threats.

7. When they break, people in the rioters' ranks—even bystanders—often get hurt or killed.

8. Those who caused armed soldiers to "break" are more to blame than the soldiers.

Students who cause this to happen are deficient in ordinary good judgment.

9. Unfortunately, it generally follows that incidents which result in casualties break the tension and cause those who are prone to riot to take a hard look at such tactics and stop using them. This has resulted from recent incidents.

10. Thus such incidents cause people to look at their problems rationally instead of emotionally. It is unfortunate they do not do it before people are hurt or killed.

11. The "inciters" to riot are really to blame, not the unfortunate young soldiers who have been called out by our elected officials to do a very distasteful and necessary job under very trying conditions.

"There is no grievance that is a fit object for redress by mob law."—A. Lincoln.

ALASKAN NATIVE CONCERNS IGNORED IN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT ON PROPOSED TRANS-ALASKA PIPELINE

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the Interior Department's final environmental impact statement on the trans-Alaska pipeline largely ignores the very legitimate concerns of the Alaskan Natives.

I would like to include in the RECORD today an excellent comment submitted to the Interior Department by Patrick Macrory of the law firm of Arnold and Porter on behalf of several Alaskan Native villages. This comment quite accurately details both the likely consequences of the construction and operation of the trans-Alaska oil pipeline on these Native villages and the failings of the impact statement to adequately consider and mitigate these expected consequences.

I urge my colleagues to read this important document, which follows:

COMMENTS ON ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT ISSUED BY U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR CONCERNING THE TRANS-ALASKA PIPELINE

(Submitted on Behalf of The Native Villages of Allakaket, Bettles, Minto, Rampart and Stevens Village)

These comments are submitted by five Indian Villages situated close to the proposed Trans-Alaska Pipeline. Two witnesses, Chief Richard Frank and David Wolf, Esq., testified on behalf of these villages at the hearings held by the Department of the Interior in 1971.

Although the Impact Statement represents some improvement over the draft Impact Statement released by the Department in January 1971, it remains inadequate in many important areas vital to the needs of Alaska's native population.¹ Moreover, the stipula-

¹ These inadequacies cannot be analyzed in full here because of the pressures of time. Only 45 days have been allowed for comment on a nine-volume report, more than 2500 pages in length. We find it difficult to avoid the conclusion that the Department regards the expression of views by members of the public as a *pro forma* exercise.

Three deficiencies may be briefly noted: (a) the failure to discuss the need for a further Impact Statement when final, as op-

tions which the Department would require Alyeska to enter into as a condition of granting the pipeline permits it seeks are weak and insubstantial. They afford neither our villages nor any of the native villages situated near the pipeline any significant protection from the impact of the pipeline project.

The remarkable fact is that, despite the enormous quantities of additional evidence obtained by and submitted to the Department as to the adverse impact of the pipeline on Alaska's natives, the stipulations affecting the native population are virtually unchanged from the original stipulations contained in the first draft of the Impact Statement. The Department has simply ignored the extensive evidence gathered by and the views of the persons most affected by the pipeline, the natives of Alaska. The Department evidently considers it sufficient compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act merely to obtain the views of other government departments and the public, without permitting those views to have any bearing on a decision apparently already reached. The Secretary of the Interior is the trustee for the native people of Alaska; they are his wards and are entitled by law to his protection. The present stipulations are an abdication of trust by the Department of the Interior.

A. THE IMPACT OF THE PIPELINE AND HAUL ROAD

1. Oil Leaks of Unpredictable Magnitude and Serious Siltation of Rivers are Virtually Certain to Occur

A few excerpts from the Impact Statement make graphically plain the enormous risks to the environment, and to Alaska's natives, that the Trans-Alaska Pipeline would entail:

"... the performance record of pipelines in general and the abundance of environmental factors in Alaska that could contribute to pipeline rupture are such that perfect no-spill performance would be unlikely during the lifetime of the pipeline. It therefore is likely that some spills would occur, but their size, location and frequency are indeterminate." (Vol. 1, p. 27, emphasis supplied here and throughout.)

"Any point along the southern two-thirds of the proposed pipeline route could be subjected to an earthquake of magnitude greater than 7.0 on the Richter Scale, and it is almost a certainty that one or more large magnitude earthquakes will occur in the vicinity of this portion of the proposed route during the lifetime of the pipeline. Strong ground motion and large ground displacement accompanying such an earthquake could damage—even rupture—the proposed pipeline." (Id., p. 97.)

"The excavation of construction materials in areas of ice-rich permafrost would cause the permafrost to thaw. The materials could become unstable and flow or slide, especially on slopes. Locally, excavation in flood plains might cause diversion of stream channels, and where such excavation occurred, pools would form and siltation would follow." (Id., p. 95.)

"Thawing of permafrost by heat from the pipeline and by redirected surface and ground water could result in slope failure and differential settlement in areas under-

posed to preliminary, design plans for the pipeline are submitted to the Department;

(b) the inadequate discussion of the possibility of running the natural gas pipeline that will be needed to bring natural gas from the North Slope along the same route as the oil pipeline; and

(c) the failure of the Statement to consider the possibility that the demand for oil will be greatly diminished as a result of widespread use in automobiles of the Wankel rotary engine, which is much more efficient than the internal combustion engine.

lain by ice-rich sediments. Either effect could cause serious damage to the pipeline." (Id., pp. 96-97.)

The Statement admits that in the pipeline segment between mile 345.6 and mile 521.9 (i.e., the area of the five villages whose views are here expressed), "a major impact effect of the pipeline would be associated with the generally ice-rich silts, permafrost temperatures near 0° C, moderate to steep slopes and the likelihood of seismic events." (Id., p. 99.)

Further:

"It is predicted that some damage would occur to the aquatic resources as a result of the project. . . ." (Vol. 4, p. 126.)

"Pipeline and road construction activities would result in erosion and stream siltation." (Vol. 4, p. 128.)

2. The Impact of the Project on the Animal Resources of the Region

As we have shown, the Impact Statement predicts that oil leaks of some magnitude are almost inevitable, and that there is a strong possibility of a break in the pipeline. If a break occurs, "14,000 barrels of oil could leak out during the time required for pump station shutdown and valve closure", and "up to an additional 50,000 barrels of oil could drain from the pipeline at some localities" thereafter. (Vol. 1, p. 124.) The effect of an oil spill of this magnitude would be catastrophic to our villages and to others in its wake. It could wipe out the fish population of an entire river system such as the Yukon. A vital part of the subsistence economy of the native population of Alaska could thus be eliminated in large regions crossed by the pipeline.

The Statement concedes that the effect of the pipeline on large mammals—another important element in the native subsistence economy—could be equally serious.

"Disturbances associated with construction activities and road and pipeline maintenance and operation would have adverse effects on large mammals inhabiting the proposed right-of-way and areas adjacent to the pipeline route. . . . Direct disturbances as well as physical disruption of their habitat would undoubtedly result in displacement of large mammals from the pipeline route and areas immediately adjacent to it." (Vol. 1, pp. 126-27.)

"The effect of the above-ground portions of the pipeline on large mammal movement cannot be conclusively predicted. . . . However, it does appear . . . that above-ground elevated portions of the pipeline with frequent provision of animal crossing facilities of the best available design would still act as partial barriers to the movement of hoofed animals" (Id., p. 128.)

"The combined barrier effects of the highway and pipeline might reduce the number of animals using the winter range east of the highway." (Id., p. 129.)

The Statement admits that the effect of the above-ground portions of the pipeline "would probably alter the distribution of caribou in the future and account for the abandonment of portions of their range." (Vol. 1, p. 200.) It also admits that:

"Several situations conducive to large mammal mortality would result from pipeline and haul road construction and their maintenance." (Id., p. 130.)

"The increased human population would be reflected in a general increase in hunting pressures on large mammals." (Id., pp. 130-31.)

3. The Impact on the Native Population

The specific impact of the pipeline on our villages is also described in some detail in the Statement:

"A significant adverse impact on land use for Native subsistence purposes could be incurred in the event that, during the construction or operational stages of either road

* An extremely high proportion of the pipeline will be above ground in the area closest to the five villages in question.

or pipeline, streams or other areas essential to subsistence harvests were severely contaminated by oil or other toxic materials. In addition to the direct and indirect impacts, this could cause major shifts in local land use patterns. Both the direct damage and the shifts could be costly to resource bases, local communities, the State, and the oil industry. If such adverse impacts did occur, they would very likely affect subsistence-dependent villages such as Anaktuvuk, Allakaket, Alatna, Stevens Village, Rampart, and Minto." (Vol. 1, p. 146.)

"The threat of adverse impacts on the Native subsistence resources would come primarily during the operational stage of the proposed project. These could stem from (1) damage to subsistence resources resulting from losses of oil, (2) increased recreational activities and other competition on lands close to the transport corridor, or (3) possible shifts in migratory patterns of caribou.

"The greatest threat would be that of potential oil spillage, especially in a major river. Local water supplies, fish and wildlife harvests, and transport corridors could be adversely affected. Such impacts on the resource base, depending on the extent of damage and on the extent of Native dependence upon the subsistence base in the affected area, could be detrimental to the livelihood of the local population. An accidental spill could be much more significant in the relatively well populated Yukon River watershed than in the Copper and Lowe River systems, where the reliance on a subsistence economy is less, both in terms of numbers of villages and numbers of Natives." (Id., p. 159.)

B. THE FAILURE OF THE STIPULATIONS TO PROTECT THE INTERESTS OF THE NATIVE POPULATION OF ALASKA

As we have shown in Section A above, the Impact Statement itself demonstrates that the construction and operation of the pipeline will inevitably have a serious impact on the subsistence economy relied upon by the vast majority of the inhabitants of the five villages whose views are here presented. Yet the stipulations do nothing whatever to compensate these people for the loss of their livelihood—despite the fact that the Secretary of the Interior is their legal guardian.

Clearly, if our nation's asserted need for more oil is deemed to justify the proposed pipeline, at the cost of the Natives' ability to support themselves from the land, they must be compensated in some way. As we suggested at the hearing, there are two means by which this could be done: First, the Natives could be given the right to compensation for damage to their lands or subsistence caused by pipeline construction and operation, in order to protect them from the immediate impact of the pipeline. Second, they could be guaranteed a certain proportion of the jobs connected with the construction and operation of the pipeline, as protection against the effects of the long-term trend away from a subsistence economy which the Statement predicts the pipeline will cause.

The stipulations do neither of these things. Although the suggestion has been made on many occasions that the Department should impose absolute liability on Alyeska for damage caused to private persons—as it proposes to do for damage caused to the federal government—the Department dismisses the suggestion with the following comment:

"... the February 1972 stipulations impose liability on the permittee. The Department believes that to impose further liability would exceed the Department's authority." (Vol. 6, p. 52).

The first of these statements is simply in-

* The villages whose names are here are four of the five villages whose views are here presented.

correct. All that the February 1972 stipulations do is to recite that the permittee will be liable to third parties "in accordance with applicable laws." (Stip. 1.7.1.) Clearly, of course, this would be the case even without the stipulation. The stipulation "imposes" no liability on the permittee beyond what the law would impose in any event. It gives private persons affected by the pipeline absolutely no additional guarantee of compensation against loss.

The second statement is almost certainly erroneous. The Department has extremely broad power to impose conditions on pipeline permittees (see Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, Section 28, 30 U.S.C. § 185; 43 C.F.R. § 2801.1-6(h)), and further was specifically directed by Congress in the Conference Report on the Alaska Native Claims Act to "take any action necessary to protect the subsistence needs of the Natives." At the very least, if the Department is unsure of its authority, it should take immediate steps to clarify the legal position. We strongly endorse the suggestion of the Alaska Federation of Natives that an opinion of the Attorney-General be sought on this issue.

The double standard incorporated in the present stipulations—which impose absolute liability on the permittee for damage to the federal government, which does not need the protection, but no liability for damage to the government's impoverished native wards who desperately do need it—is a gross violation of the Department's trusteeship obligations and of the standards by which a government department should conduct itself.

The second deficiency is in the area of jobs and training. The Statement concludes that without "quantitative goals for Native employment" and "specific means for attaining them," Native participation in the pipeline project will be adversely affected. (Vol. 4, p. 409.) The Statement points out that "Alyeska's employment estimates do not include a commitment to a numerical goal for Native hiring." (*Id.*, p. 410.) However, the stipulations impose no obligation whatever upon Alyeska to establish numerical goals for Native employment. They merely require Alyeska to "do everything within its power" (a notorious euphemism for total inaction) to secure the employment of Natives who successfully complete its training program. (Stip. 1.14.3.)

The stipulations are equally deficient in the area of Native training. The Statement asserts that with only a minimal amount of training a very large number of Natives could meet the job skill requirements (see Vol. 4, pp. 411-12) but warns that:

"To date there are no training programs planned, and unless this planning is accomplished well in advance of the start of pipeline construction, it is unlikely that training programs would be effectively phased into the requirements of the construction activities." (Vol. 4, p. 414.)

Once again, however, the stipulations themselves simply ignore the Statement. Stipulation 1.14.1 provides only that Alyeska "shall enter into an agreement with the Secretary regarding . . . training . . . of Alaska Natives." There is no indication that any such agreement has been reached, what the proposed terms would be, or what planning for timely training has been undertaken, if any.

ANTIBUSING AMENDMENT NOW IS IMPERATIVE

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Nashville Banner in a recent editorial

emphasized the importance of passing a constitutional amendment banning the busing of students to achieve a numerical racial balance.

I endorse the sentiments expressed in the Banner editorial concerning the need and necessity for such an amendment.

While the editorial refers to Senators BAKER and BROCK from Tennessee, I would add that many Members of Congress—Democrats and Republicans—on a bipartisan basis—are cosponsors of similar legislation in the House and indeed many Representatives have signed a discharge petition to bring to the floor a constitutional amendment to prohibit busing.

In addition, the House has passed three amendments to curb busing, with substantial support, as follows:

The Ashbrook amendment which would bar the expenditure of Federal funds for crosstown busing.

The Green amendment which would prohibit the Federal Government from requiring school districts to spend State or local money to finance busing.

The Broomfield amendment which would permit school districts to delay compliance with busing orders issued by lower courts until all appeals have been exhausted.

I support all three of these amendments.

The House has taken definite and definitive action to curb and halt unnecessary and undesirable racial balance busing.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter, I place the editorial from the Nashville Banner in the RECORD herewith.

The editorial follows:

[From the Nashville Banner, May 31, 1972]

ANTIBUSING AMENDMENT NOW IS IMPERATIVE

To the surprise of few, if any, the U.S. Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals has affirmed Judge L. C. Morton's order of massive crosstown school busing for compulsory racial balance; but the fact that such a decision was expected for the reasons asserted in the language of the court does not modify the urgency of remedial action—for redress of the system-wide injury inflicted—by the corrective method clearly demanded.

That would be, of course, by constitutional amendment—the provision of that organic instrument, itself, for the exercise of final authority where it belongs, in the hands of the people.

It not only is obligatory that the amending power be employed—putting the principle and concept of school authority in such a particular beyond eccentric manipulation either legislative, executive, or judicial—but it is imperative.

It needs to be done now, before the damage so disruptive and nearly destructive of the local public school system, here or anywhere, is compounded by another school year of magnifying costs and mounting chaos. Never in the history of this city have its approximately 100,000-member student body, and its school plant community-wide, divested of the neighborhood school prerogatives, suffered a comparable blow.

The corrective device sought is in this instance for Congress to initiate—as it has started a number of times to do, only to be side-tracked by a totally unsatisfactory substitute.

Sen. Bill Brock, with co-sponsorship by a number of colleagues similarly aware of the crisis confronted up a usurpation of school authority—has pushed for an amendment

forbidding that trespass. Tennessee's Senior Senator, Howard Baker, has pushed for its adoption. The sense of it has been stated in another proposed amendment, by Michigan Sen. Robert Griffin, declaring that:

"No court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to make any decision, enter into any judgment or issue any order the effect of which would be to require that pupils be transported to or from school on the basis of their race, color, religion, or national origin."

State by state, in the South and elsewhere, school patrons, taxpayers and voters—one and the same—have gone clearly on record for an end to massive school busing for achievement of racial balance. They have done that, as in Tennessee, in direct referendum on the question itself—overwhelmingly for the amendment. They have done it in party primary balloting, as in the George Wallace vote itself, or its margin, in which such clearly was the principal message.

Congress has condemned the massive busing operation as an instrument of arbitrary, bureaucracy-ordered racial balance. It has done that in legislation enacted, as in the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

President Nixon has called for correction of the outrage jointly inflicted by HEW fiat and court intrusion—and for return to the historic format of the neighborhood school system, with regulations thereof vested in the hands of local authority.

Now is the time to get on with that, via the only route by which it can be achieved—the method clearly preferred by the majority of the American people, irrespective of race. It is their school system. It also is their Constitution. It is time to employ the one, with vigor, honor and courage, in behalf of justice for the other.

Congress clearly has the duty to submit this amendment to the people of these United States, for their decision. If that preliminary, enabling action is taken in time, the school year beginning in September conceivably could be spared the chaos that otherwise impends for it.

SALT ANALYSIS

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following has been prepared by me and is being delivered to all Members of the Congress on June 6:

JUNE 6, 1972.

From: Representative Craig Hosmer, Chairman, GOP Task Force on Nuclear Affairs.

To: Members of Congress

Subject: SALT—ABM Treaty & Offensive Weapons Interim Agreement

It is generally conceded that America and Russia cannot risk attacking each other because their nuclear arsenals are sufficient to withstand surprise attack and still have enough undamaged retaliatory hardware left over to pulverize the aggressor.

President Nixon and Premier Brezhnev believe it is in the self-interest of their respective countries to perpetuate this condition of mutual deterrence based on nuclear sufficiency. The proposed SALT Treaty limiting defensive anti-ballistic missile systems and its accompanying interim agreement limiting certain offensive weapons was designed for this purpose.

The rationale of the ABM limitation is obvious. Each new ABM built by one side can be nullified by the other's new offensive installation. It is in nobody's security in-

terest to spend money for that kind of an arms race only to end up poorer, but no safer than before.

The logic of allowing the Soviets a lopsided number of offensive missiles and submarines is obscure if quantity alone is considered. It emerges clearly, however, when other factors, relevant to assessing the kill power of these two nation's strategic nuclear arsenals are taken into account. These include the following:

The actual number of nuclear warheads in the U.S. deterrent package considerably exceeds those of the Soviets because of our many multiple independently guided re-entry vehicles (MIRVs).

The greater accuracy of the U.S. warheads gives them a proportionately large kill capability, ample for nuclear sufficiency.

U.S. allies and near allies possess substantial strategic deterrent forces which augment the Free World's overall deterrent posture.

The arrangements impose no limitations at all on certain U.S. systems contributing to our deterrent strength, such as SAC bombers and U.S. aircraft based overseas on land and on aircraft carriers.

"Sufficiently to deter" is something in the mind of the beholder and when one side fields a mix of bombers, ICBMs and SLBMs with which it is satisfied, the other side would need to assume very large and unknown risks of miscalculation in order to assess it as "insufficient."

What are inside the strategic systems, how good they are now and how they may be qualitatively improved are not covered by the arrangements, leaving the parties in exactly the same circumstances, whatever they are, as before.

Provision for verification by each party's own intelligence apparatus involves minimal risk, since the arrangements are cast in terms of items which reasonably can be monitored by satellite photography and similar means.

The foregoing and many additional calculations undoubtedly influenced President Nixon's determination that the agreements are worthwhile and that their terms involve neither undue risks to United States security nor disproportionate advantage to the Soviet Union.

In making his decision the President also must have tallied the quite large costs of the superpowers taking no steps at all toward arms control against those involved in the limited agreements he made in Moscow. No person better knows these costs than he and his judgment deserves great respect.

To assure that the arrangements do not grow lopsided by the passage of time, Congress must support the President's R&D requests for the TRIDENT submarine program, the B-1 bomber and other improved strategic systems.

AGRICULTURE HONORS FOUR FROM MARYLAND'S FIFTH DISTRICT

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was recently privileged to be present at the annual Honor Awards ceremony of the U.S. Department of Agriculture where four men from Maryland's Fifth District were among those honored for their superior service as employees of the Department.

Mr. Speaker, these are the kind of men who make our Government truly responsive to the needs of our citizens,

and I think we all owe them a special vote of thanks. They are Mr. William Gladden, Seat Pleasant; Mr. James H. Lauth, Bowie; Dr. Louis P. Reitz, Hyattsville; and Mr. Robert A. Fast, Beltsville.

NIXON'S DIPLOMACY

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the June 1, 1972, edition of the newspaper, Chicago Today, discusses President Nixon's recent initiatives in the field of foreign policy in a most perceptive and knowledgeable manner and I commend its text to my colleagues. I insert it in the RECORD at this point.

The editorial follows:

NIXON'S DIPLOMACY

President Nixon has taken giant strides toward world peace. He returns to the United States as one of the most successful diplomats in history, the time alone can measure the true results of his diplomacy. This diplomacy has ended the power stalemate and given the world leaders an opportunity to move toward world peace. The skepticism of those who remember the broken treaties of history is understandable. But this time there is a new factor, introduced by Mr. Nixon and Henry A. Kissinger: By its rapprochement with China, the United States has taken control of the balance of forces.

A few months ago, the U. S. S. R. could move in the power struggle with China in relative confidence that the United States would not choose sides. But no more. When President Nixon went to China, the possibility opened up that the United States might agree to provide the Chinese with the sophisticated weapons needed to defend their 1,500-mile border with the U. S. S. R. Russia cannot suffer that. The new posture of the Russians, the reluctant wooing of the U. S., began when Kissinger made the first breakthrough to Peking.

More than a century ago, Karl Marx, the ideological source for both Russia and China, pointed out on the basis of his long study of their history that Russia and China are the world's most natural, enduring and implacable foes. The Russians forgot this temporarily after World War II, when they helped to arm and industrialize the Chinese. But they were forced to remember as the ancient enmity erupted. The main Russian and Chinese armies are now spread along that 1,500-mile border.

For a time, after China developed the nuclear bomb, the U.S.S.R. even considered a preemptive strike. So, we are told, did President John Kennedy. President Nixon had a better idea, an offer of friendship. So long as the U.S. and China were virtual enemies, the U.S.S.R. had many options, including those in Europe and the Middle East. Once Mr. Nixon took the unthinkable step, a detente with China, Russia had no choice but to ease tension in Europe, to think twice about increasing pressure in the Middle East, and to seek United States friendship once more. And the United States price for friendship is a guarantee toward enduring world peace.

Thus the "Spirit of Moscow" may be more durable than the "Spirit of Camp David" and other previous attempts of the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. to come to terms. This time the United States controls the balance of power. President Nixon proved that when he ordered

the bombing attacks as North Vietnam again invaded the south.

The world shuddered, the Democratic Presidential candidates shouted their jeremiads, but the President and his adviser Kissinger knew what they were doing. Both China and Russia had to accept this new element in Vietnam because the United States once again controls the balance of power.

But only the events unfolding in the next months and years can prove the real worth of the Nixon peace policy. If the war in Vietnam ends, if there is no eruption in the Middle East, if the relaxation of the tension in Europe continues, then the new policy will prove to be the greatest diplomatic success in history.

At present, the bombing goes on because North Viet Nam refuses to check its invasion of the south. But the aid formerly received from Russia and China is no longer being received. And neither China nor Russia has formally protested to the United States, nor will they. The war must come to an end, for North Viet Nam cannot long continue this new kind of war without suppliers. Then the United States can totally withdraw, and an era of universal peace may be at hand.

Neither Machiavelli or Prince Metternich would ever have believed that diplomacy could come to this. President Wilson, seeking world accord, thought persuasion alone could do it. But President Nixon has seen that the best way to get world peace is the proper application of power. That is the kind of persuasion Communists understand. His diplomacy should bring an end to war in Viet Nam, and it should prevent other "brush fire" wars, as President Kennedy called them.

This, in turn, will enable the great powers to keep the peace. As the President returns home from the second of his brilliantly successful diplomatic journeys, it appears that the prospect for enduring world peace was never more promising.

SMALL CLAIMS COURT AS A CONSUMER REMEDY

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the seventies have become the decade of consumerism. Today more and more attention is being given to the very legitimate claims and complaints which consumers have against harmful credit reporting techniques, faulty workmanship, and poor performance.

The consumer is often hampered in remedying these situations by lack of information. Confronted by a myriad of agencies, officers, and bureaus, a disgruntled customer often gives up his attempts to seek relief.

For his reason, the Students Organized for Consumer Action—SOCA—at Boston College, under the direction of Rev. Robert J. McEwen, S.J., have prepared a series of reports designed to inform the public of gaps in necessary consumer information or protection related to products and services. SOCA bulletin No. 1 addresses itself to the subject of the small claims court as a viable instrument in consumer complaints.

I commend these students for their efforts to insure greater protection for the Massachusetts consumer, and include the text of their first bulletin for your information:

SOCA BULLETIN No. 1

SMALL CLAIMS COURT AS A CONSUMER REMEDY

The Small Claims Court should be one of the crucial tools of effective consumer action. It is a man's chance to defend himself in a court of law at little cost. However, our study of 1000 cases in four different district courts (West Roxbury, Quincy, Hingham, and Dorchester) shows consumer use of this legal remedy to be minimal. While sixty-six percent of all cases involved a company suing an individual, only five percent were individuals suing a company. There are several reasons for this.

Lack of knowledge of small claims court procedures on the part of consumers is a major problem. Few people know how to use the court. Few people even know that it exists. As a solution, we urge pamphlets be published by either the courts, the Attorney General's office, or the State Department of Education or the Consumers Council to explain the purpose and procedure of the court.

Another problem is time. Court hours are scheduled during the regular working day, a most inopportune time for the average working man who might lose money if he had to be in court. We urge that evening and Saturday court sessions be scheduled.

Thirdly, the court personnel should be made aware of their duty to the public. What is routine for them may be something entirely new for a consumer. Their willingness and ability to help is most important.

The small claims procedure was intended to provide a simple, prompt and informal means at small expense for the adjudication of small claims. For the most part the system fulfills these prerequisites. When a person believes that another party owes him money for damage to personal property, non-fulfillment of contract, etc. (in the amount of \$300 or less) he may bring suit against this party in Small Claims Court. The plaintiff goes to the Clerk of the Court. The Clerk transposes a simplified version of the plaintiff's story to a court docket and then notifies the defendant by registered mail that a complaint has been lodged against him, informing him of the nature of the complaint and the date of the trial. This whole procedure costs the plaintiff only three dollars and fifty-five cents.

If the defendant does not settle with the plaintiff out of court, then the case comes to trial in a few weeks. At that time the plaintiff brings any evidence he has to court (a torn coat from a laundry, for example), and waits for his case to be called. Either party is allowed to be represented by a lawyer, but this is not recommended by the court. The judge will listen to both sides of the story, asking questions as he sees fit. Both parties will be informed of the judge's decision by mail a week or so later. If the plaintiff wins his case, the judge will usually make the defendant reimburse him for the court costs and sometimes even for the time the plaintiff missed from work. Either party may appeal the decision to a regular court trial.

MR. FRANK SCHMIDT—A
VENERABLE GENTLEMAN

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few moments today to tell my colleagues about a man who came to our country as an immigrant 67 years ago, and whose life in his adopted country exemplifies what America is all about.

Mr. Frank Schmidt will celebrate his 89th birthday on June 16 in the company of friends and family living in my congressional district.

Mr. Schmidt arrived in America in 1905, unable to speak a word of English though he was—and still is—fluent in five other languages. Three days after his arrival he began to work as a laborer. He studied English at night, and by World War I had advanced to round-house foreman for the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. During World War I, he served the U.S. Navy as a civilian on detached duty, expediting transportation of troops and water materiel. He was selected for this role because of his railroad experience and also because he was one of the few men who could communicate in the various languages of the immigrant railroad workers. He continued with the Navy, teaching crash courses in machine skills to classes of immigrants to further the war effort. In the years after World War I he earned his teaching credentials at night school and taught in Brooklyn. With the onset of World War II, Mr. Schmidt volunteered for and taught extra after-hour courses in machine operating procedures to help meet the burgeoning manpower needs of war production.

In 1965, at the age of 82, Mr. Schmidt volunteered for VISTA, and at the organization's request moved from California to Philadelphia where he taught full-time courses in tool and diemaking to minority students at Temple University. In 1967 he was honored by the city of Philadelphia for his services and as the oldest VISTA worker in America. Just this year, upon specific invitation, he has rejoined VISTA on a part-time volunteer basis. Throughout these years he raised and educated a family and launched them on careers as productive citizens.

Mr. Schmidt's other contributions to this country notwithstanding, it is remarkable that in his 88th year, at an age when most men think only of rocking chairs and warm slippers, he serves in VISTA.

A very wise man said long ago:

Misfortune is no disgrace but doing nothing about it is—and so it is with age. We may fold our hands in the face of the infirmities that age may bring, and let the world pass us by, or we may simply forget to look for it, and find life active and good long after we have passed the promised biblical limit of days.

One can only believe that this wise man knew there would be Frank Schmidts in the world when he wrote these words.

For whatever reasons he left his native land, a man with Mr. Schmidt's character would certainly have lived the same kind of life in any country he adopted. How fortunate for all of our countrymen whose path he crossed, for they learned much from him: patriotism in the truest sense of the word; fortitude, perseverance; love of country; and the grace that service to his community and to his fellowman offers. For 67 years he gave of himself to America. This is a better country because he chose to make

it his home. The lives of all of us have in some part been enriched.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues join me in wishing Mr. Schmidt a very happy birthday on June 16.

AEROSPACE INDUSTRY

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Karl G. Harr, Jr., president of Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., recently addressed the Aero Club of Washington, D.C.

In his discussion he talked about our total national economic situation and the effect of development of high technology products as a cornerstone of our competitive world market position. I am including the significant comments of Mr. Harr in the RECORD and commend them to the reading of my colleagues and the general public.

The comments follow:

REMARKS BY KARL G. HARR, JR.

I have a gut feeling that this is neither the time, the place nor the audience for either a technical or a statistical exposition of any of the problems that confront the aerospace industry. Besides I've already spewed forth all the statistics I know on the subject and even a few I'm not quite sure about.

Rather, I think, this is a good time, place and audience for the consideration of the fundamentals of the world in which we currently live, and the analysis that must be made if we are to deal with these fundamentals.

I am not talking about a "white paper" or state-of-the-industry type survey. I am talking rather about facing up to some simple truths, on the part of ourselves, the Government and the American people as a whole, insofar as the fate and fortunes of the aerospace industry are, indeed, a matter of national concern.

Let me begin by saying there is no real question about the survival of the aerospace industry over the long run as a sound and increasingly dynamic element of the total national economic picture. Even if not just some but all of the companies that comprise the industry today were to disappear tomorrow, they would have to be immediately replaced by others in adequate numbers to fulfill national requirements of the same dimension. For air transportation has become a necessity as a means of mass transportation, not just nationally but globally; the aerospace component of national security will inevitably grow rather than diminish; the space effort will be pursued, in the long run I am convinced, on some roughly equivalent order of magnitude; and, perhaps most significantly of all, the capability to produce high technology products will become increasingly essential to our national well-being, not merely in terms of our national economic competitiveness, but also in terms of our capacity to address a multitude of new and demanding domestic problems.

However there is a real question whether we as a nation will be able to realize, in the national interest, upon the benefits of this asset called the aerospace industry in ways adequate to the challenges immediately ahead of us. Many current signs tend to indicate that we will not, and that we will as a nation pay a fearful price for this failure.

There is no simple single explanation for this failure. Nor does any person or group have a monopoly on the wisdom needed to remedy it.

Perhaps the way to begin looking for this wisdom is to examine some of the sources of today's situation. The aerospace industry, as we know it today, really came into being in the post-Korean War period. It started its surge toward that peak position, where it ranked as the nation's foremost industry on many if not most counts, sometime in the late 1950s.

Three principal factors were involved:

1. Soviet demonstration of both nuclear weapons and intercontinental delivery capability produced a reaction that led to an almost frantic U.S. effort to develop and install ICBMs; to deploy an effective retaliatory bomber deterrent; and to develop a strategic undersea deterrent.

2. The arrival of the Space Age, about the same time and with demonstrated Soviet capability therein, produced a reaction here that led to a decade of commitment to high-gear space exploration, both manned and unmanned.

3. The arrival of the Jet Age in terms of commercial air travel led to the usurpation by aviation of an enormous chunk of the travel market that had previously belonged to surface modes.

All of these factors started to gain momentum in the late 1950s and surged forward into the mid-1960s, culminating in a peak for this new industry, in terms of sales and employment, in 1968.

Where did this leave us in the late 60s? Well it meant that America had in its midst a brand new, big, heterogeneous industry with spectacular capabilities for both advanced technological and managerial accomplishments. Foreign competitor nations, mostly still struggling out of the destruction of World War II, and possessing neither the economic base nor the technological injection of comparable national efforts in space and defense began to lag behind us in overall technological advances to the point at which there was desperate concern as to whether they ever would be able to compete. The famous brain drain became very real as the U.S. became regarded as the place where the action was in all advanced technological pursuits. One thing came after another. Computers, for example, were greatly spurred by the space effort. Our transport aircraft dominance seemed permanently assured. One after another, new industrial processes seemed to be promising to widen the gap between ourselves and other nations.

In short, there was every reason to believe, and most people both here and abroad were firmly convinced, that the only problem was to keep the U.S. from hopelessly out-distancing the rest of the world in the production of high technology products.

This pace of advance, of course, obscured parallel maturing of some problems arising within the procurement process itself in this country, and it also obscured some signs of a coming alteration in the trade factors that had prevailed since World War II. In effect we were moving so fast, were doing so well that there was a general complacency about some of these small black clouds. Many assumed we could ignore them.

However, in 1967 or 1968 there began a rapid and radical turnaround. Competition for priority on the part of shrieking domestic concerns reached a crescendo simultaneously with a general abatement of fear about overall national defense, the subsiding of concern about space competition and general and widespread disenchantment with the Vietnam War.

There was a very rapid and almost complete flip-flop in public attitudes crystallizing into a reaction against technology generally. The frenzy of a mere decade earlier to "catch up" in engineering students

turned into a virtual discrediting of the profession. For a time at least there was an almost universal return, particularly among youth, to the Walden's Pond syndrome—a rejection not only of the so-called military industrial complex, but of all technological advance.

This tide culminated in, if you will permit me, the emotional and irrational rejection of the supersonic transport at what was certainly the most uneconomical time and for the most absurd reasons. The SST was, in my view, a hapless victim of unfortunate timing.

Okay, so that was a year ago—and now we have had time to look at the effects of this overreaction and have started to pick up the pieces.

In these calmer times we all can take a somewhat longer view—and what we see down the road, and not very far down the road at that, is pretty frightening.

In our violent transition from a period of accelerated technological advance—a virtual technological revolution—to a period of intense and almost exclusive preoccupation with domestic social problems, we have come perilously close to throwing the baby out with the bath water.

For during this transition period, say 1967 or 1968 to the present, not only have our principal competitor nations been moving feverishly in the opposite direction, but we seem to have completely lost sight of some of the fundamentals upon which both our economic and national security survival have always been based.

So now we are awakening to some rude surprises. A trade deficit for the first time in 80 years. A productivity growth rate for the past five years lower than that of any major industrial nation. An inability for the first time in modern history to accumulate the financial resources necessary to proceed with the next generation's research and development. A reverse brain drain. Hordes of skilled scientists and engineers—so desperately needed and recruited a few short years ago—serving as short order cooks. The very real prospect of seeing the world's air transport fleets, now nearly 80% equipped with American aircraft, become predominantly foreign built. An American superiority in weapons systems drastically undercut both qualitatively and quantitatively. A drying up of the undergraduate and graduate school pools from which our future scientists and engineers must come. Hundreds of thousands of skilled and semi-skilled workers newly unemployed and largely unemployable at their skills.

In general terms, a lopping off at the knees of that giant which has stood us in such good stead both in terms of our national economic well-being and our national security since World War II—the capability of producing high-technology products, for whatever purpose, far better than any other nation in the world.

Where does that leave us now?

Well, I suggest, it at least gives us considerable food for thought. There's a very human tendency to believe when you first realize something that you discovered it, and a lot of people are busy "discovering" today that we're in a hell of a fix. Publications ranging from the scholarly to the most current mass media are full of it. Those faced with all or a piece of the problem are and have been for some time busily grappling with it. Now, I recognize that few if any of us can individually comprehend all of the factors that must be taken into consideration. I certainly do not pretend to be able to do so. The most, and perhaps the best, one can do is to candidly and objectively as possible put forth from his own perspective the facts as he sees them.

So here goes.

First, this nation is due for a rude jolt not very far down the road in terms of its

international trade position. Gradually over the past decade the advantages we have had in this regard have slipped away and now we are in jeopardy of losing those last few key elements which have kept our heads above water. This focuses very much on the aerospace industry because of its central identification with our national capacity to produce superior high technology products. To date we have been able to overcome labor costs advantages on the part of our competitors. We have been able to overcome myriad forms of government support to our competitors. We have been able to afford sometimes superb neglect of support of exports by our own government. Today we no longer are in a position to do this. Some of all of the competitive advantages of our revived, resuscitated and hungry competitors must be countered if we are to retain our world leadership in high technology products. Whatever steps we take, whatever practical combination of measures we adopt to survive this challenge, they must stem from and be consistent with the acceptance of one fundamental strategy. The Government, fully supported by industry, labor and the public at large, must adopt as a national goal the maintenance of a positive trade balance. In every way consistent with our other national policies this goal must be supported by positive export policies. Particularly, given the current situation, these policies must be designed to emphasize promotion of internationally competitive high-technology products, because it is such products that represent our strongest card in the international market place.

Second, even if the foregoing principle is fully adopted, the nation will still be in for that rude jolt if it doesn't have the capacity to produce such superior products for export, and today that capacity is in jeopardy. Obviously this deficiency transcends the question of international trade and involves as well both our domestic economic growth and serious questions of national security.

In a number of ways and for a variety of reasons we are now neglecting research and development. We are neglecting it in terms of direct Government funding, and we are neglecting it in terms of the policies confronting private funding. We also are suffering from the fact that under our system the rising costs of research and development put us at a disadvantage compared with our principal competitors in terms of assembling, from private sources as we must do, the financial resources necessary to the task.

Here again, we need to accept, as a nation, a long-range national technological strategy. Such a strategy must of course be responsive to the nation's needs in the fullest sense, but it also must be supported by a mechanism that can establish and pursue research and development goals, objectives, priorities and programs, and also provide adequate funding.

Third, we are paying an unnecessary price for our failure to find ways effectively to apply some of our superb technological and managerial skills to a whole range of domestic problem areas in which there is an obvious potential contribution for such skills.

Many of us could write brilliant and sophisticated essays on the problems and obstacles associated with effectively making such transfers. This subject has been the great intellectual plaything of the last five to 10 years. Many of us in the industry, in Government at all levels and branches, and in the intellectual community have been debating our respective breasts about it for some time. Although I don't for a moment suggest that the many problems uncovered through experience or study are unreal or will be solved easily, I don't think it's beyond our national genius to analyze the fundamental first steps that must be taken toward their solution. Some of these, I am pleased to say, already are underway in the Executive Branch. Programs to identify major domestic problems having a potential for tech-

nological solution and to fund their R&D have been initiated. But this must not be a one-shot effort. It must be a continuing program and it must be accompanied by funded demonstration programs backed by a concentrated Government effort to find solutions to such problem areas. Only in that way will the puzzle that has so fascinated us be solved.

Fourth, all of the foregoing relates in greater or lesser degree to questions affecting our national security. I would merely point out one simple fact in this regard. Since World War II the United States has deterred war with a posture based on a limited force-in-being equipped with superior weaponry. Such superiority has been made possible by viable industry, active technological competition, adequate research and development funding and sufficient procurement of advanced systems.

As in the case of our international competitive position we in the industry now are concerned with our ability to meet our share of future defense requirements if present trends continue. You all know the overall employment story, but of even greater importance in this particular connection is the national reduction in numbers of scientists and engineers. Many vital technological and managerial teams have been broken up with a resultant erosion of the future technological capability on which our national security must be based.

The simple conclusion and remedy here seem to me to be logically inescapable. If we as a nation are to continue to base our national security on modern forces-in-being, relying on qualitatively superior weaponry, then we must fund both research and development, and procurement, adequately.

Fifth, again inescapably intertwined with the foregoing but having its own special place in the future of this country, is the treatment we as a nation accord the greatest national adventure we have ever undertaken, the exploration of space. Perhaps more than any other element of our concern; perhaps even more, in a sense, than questions affecting national security, our national willingness or unwillingness to proceed with this effort so rich in demonstrated benefits of all kinds, will foretell our spiritual strength to face the future. As a nation we now have a fine plant, superb teams of skilled people and programs intelligently designed to reap maximum benefits for the nation. There are many untapped practical applications for space research utilizing the space shuttle. Earth orbiting satellites, weather control, communications advances and the management of our natural resources, despite many accomplishments already made, have only scratched the surface in improving our own environment.

Common sense, it seems to me, once again dictates the policy course that is in the best national interest. We must utilize efficiently the existing research and development capability and capacity that are made available to us through the Space Program. We should, of course, emphasize projects having the greatest potential for solution of man's problems on Earth, but above all we should take optimum advantage of the opportunity afforded us by the efforts and public investments of the last dozen years.

What indeed have I been talking all around in this recital of fundamental problems? They all relate to one central proposition.

We cannot as a nation afford the loss of technological momentum that we have undergone and are undergoing today. We cannot afford it in terms of our competitive position in an increasingly dynamic world economy. We cannot afford it in terms of our national security. And we cannot afford it in terms of the options available to us to address a host of critical domestic problems.

Who can't afford it?

Well, obviously industry, and particularly an industry such as ours, can't afford it because technological superiority is that which keeps us competitive. Labor can't afford it because the productivity based on technological superiority is what keeps our labor force competitive. The American consumer can't afford it because the price of his consumer products is directly tied to the competitiveness of American industry and labor. But above all, the nation as a whole can't afford it because its prosperity, freedom and progress are, and have been for a quarter of a century, tied directly to it.

I give you these thoughts with some humility. I fully realize that they are neither new nor startling. Yet they are clearly central to our national dilemma. We cannot spend too much time or effort working toward their resolution. Perhaps nothing else we can concern ourselves with at this moment in history is of greater importance.

EULOGY TO JAMES PORTER SEIDENSTICKER

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague, Andy Jacobs, recently delivered a eulogy to James Porter Seidensticker, a well-known and well-respected Indianapolis resident. "Port" Seidensticker served his city, his party, and his country well during his long lifetime, service that is well documented in the eulogy that follows:

EULOGY TO JAMES PORTER SEIDENSTICKER,
MAY 26, 1972

We gather together for continuing tribute to a remarkable life. Port Seidensticker was a person of deep, strong and idealistic principles, and just a little cantankerous.

In 1916 James Porter Seidensticker was first elected to office—President of his senior class at Shortridge High School in Indianapolis. He was then and continued throughout most of his life to be an outstanding athlete.

His studies at Indiana University were interrupted by World War I and his conspicuously intelligent choice among the various branches of American military service. He, of course, became a Marine. When Americans came back from "over there," Port continued his studies at Carnegie Tech and later became secretary to the National Commander of the American Legion. And a while later he was the executive secretary of the Indianapolis Junior Chamber of Commerce.

In 1920 when Governor Cox and Franklin Roosevelt sought the Presidency and Vice Presidency on the Democratic ticket and Harding was awarded the Presidency on the Republican ticket, Porter Seidensticker was elected to his first public office on the Democratic ticket. Port became Democratic precinct committeeman in 1920 and thus began a political career that was to continue for fifty years as party precinct committeeman, ward chairman and delegate to Democratic Conventions. There he goes—with straw hat and ribbons proclaiming without equivocation who his candidate is; likely as not standing on the Convention floor before the rostrum demanding regular order and that the rules be followed. "Those were the days, my friend."

"All that you do, do with your might, for things done by half are never done right." Those words could have been written about Port Seidensticker.

In the 1920's Port helped organize the Indiana and Marion County Young Democrats. And he, together with his famous father, the former Postmaster of Indianapolis, stood up when the standing up was rough against the Ku Klux Klan in Indiana. "Be strong and of good courage, be not afraid. Neither be dismayed." Can you imagine Port Seidensticker not strong? Can you conceive of his lacking courage? And did anybody ever see Port Seidensticker dismayed?

During the 1930's Port continued his active participation in the affairs of the American Legion and organized alert opposition to the growing Nazi cancer in Europe.

When World War II happened, Port Seidensticker was there, forty-two years of age, volunteering and because of his remarkably good physical condition, being accepted once again in the United States Marine Corps.

It is 1945. Can't you see him, standing there in that elevator, ramrod straight, tears streaming down his cheeks in a way that made crying strong and expressive, upon his hearing those four catastrophic words, "Franklin Roosevelt is dead."

In 1947 James Porter Seidensticker was elected from the First District to become City Councilman of Indianapolis and continued to serve during the administration of Mayor Al Feeney.

In 1971 they finally gave him the Adlai E. Stevenson award for excellence in political service and civic performance.

Though he rose to the highest councils of our city, his basic MOS never ceased being the precinct, just as a Marine's basic MOS is always infantry.

Port Seidensticker was rightly known as the Committeeman's Committeeman.

Jud Haggerty has suggested that some of us see life in black and white while others see it in technicolor. Not only did Port Seidensticker see life in technicolor, but somehow he arranged such reception for all the rest of us who have been privileged to come in contact with him. Look at the magnificent humanity some of us might have missed had there been no Port Seidensticker. Can't you hear him? "I'm going to call Chet Schonecker and Bessie Gasaway and Jimmy Slinger and some more of my friends and see what they think."

And in the precincts of politics he remained the tough D.I., the Marine Corps drill instructor afraid of nobody when he was satisfied he was on the right side. And if you knew Port you know he was always so satisfied. If Port was for you, you didn't need to question it. And if he was against you, he had a way of making you believe that, too.

Port Seidensticker never stopped believing what he learned in his high school civics class. He believed in the most idealistic concept of democracy and the nobility of its participants.

Political Science Professor Stoner of Indiana University had once said jokingly that sometimes it seemed "Government is that means by which the strong will take what they would have taken anyway and the weak may retire gracefully." Can you in your wildest imaginings see Port Seidensticker retiring gracefully at the hands of the so-called politically strong?

In 1958 a high British official visited the United States, not having done so for a decade. He was asked what change in our country impressed him most. And he replied that in 1948 the average citizen seemed to question and require proof from his government but that by 1958 Americans seemed to be going along and saying, "Well I guess that must be right."

That might have been true of many Americans but it wasn't true of Port. Listen, "Are we going to take orders from the politicians downtown? No—o—o! We're the little peo-

ple. We're in the precincts. They work for us. We don't work for them." What a delight. What refreshment. What a privilege that Port passed our way.

Even into advanced years there he was climbing the long flights of stairs in the apartment buildings of the fourth precinct, fourth ward in Indianapolis, knocking on the doors, tipping his hat, urging the people to participate in the people's business of politics.

On primary day his base of operation was not at precinct headquarters. It was a comprehensive war room replete with company runners at the ready, mechanized forces manning their automobiles at the curb and his own situation map, a huge hunk of cardboard listing every voter, the time of day each preferred to vote, who needed reminding, who needed a ride, who needed cajoling, and who needed a sidewalk repaired. And throughout it all, there was his Sally smiling broadly as if somehow to counterbalance the cantankerous when it burst forth to admonish us "Young fellows are going to have to learn."

All the King's horses and all the King's men never got Port into line. Because being "out of line" was exactly in line with James Porter Seidensticker's concept of what American democracy and a precinct committeeman were all about.

Elmer Davis said this country was not created by cowards, and it will not be maintained by them either. James Porter Seidensticker, Sr. was no coward. He was and his memory is all that any American, Jefferson, Jackson and all the others might have hoped for.

PEERS COMMISSION REPORT

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the New York Times published portions of the My Lai massacre report known as the Peers Commission report. I believe that Army Secretary Robert Froehlke should release the entire 260-page document.

It is foolish for the Government to withhold a document, part of which has already been published. Rather than rely on excerpts published in one newspaper, Members of Congress and the public should have an opportunity to study the entire document.

As many of my colleagues may know, on April 4 I filed a Freedom of Information Act suit seeking release of the massacre documents.

Originally, the Government was scheduled to respond to my suit on Monday, before Federal District Judge John H. Pratt. However, on Friday the Government filed a motion requesting an additional 2-week delay. Obviously the Government is stalling in order to cover up the unpublished portions of the report. Surely the Government knows its position by now and these delaying tactics only reveal the Government's total disregard for the public's right to know the contents of the report.

I will continue to press for a full hearing of this case as soon as possible.

Those portions of the report published by the New York Times raised serious questions about the effectiveness of our

system of military justice. General Koster and General Young have been accused of 43 specific charges of misconduct. It is clear that they should answer those charges before a military tribunal.

I am also calling upon Secretary Froehlke to report to the American people what the Army has done to improve the training of infantry soldiers to prevent another My Lai tragedy. The Peers Commission report recommends that the training be improved in the rules of war for our soldiers and the procedures for the reporting of war crimes be simplified.

However, the specific recommendations of the Peers Commission report and what actions the Army has taken remain a mystery.

SOVIET RECORD IN 25 SUMMIT AGREEMENTS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, Americans are being asked at this time to gamble with the national security of their country and to curtail arms production and development on the basis of a treaty signed by our own leaders and those of the Soviet Union.

If the Soviet record with regard to keeping its treaty obligations was an honorable one, that gamble might well be worth taking. All of us want peace, and none would seek to fuel a race in armaments unless it was necessary for our continued security.

The Soviet record, however, could hardly be worse. In seven summit meetings between a U.S. President and a Soviet leader, 25 agreements have been reached. The Soviets have violated 24 of those 25 agreements according to a staff study for the Senate Judiciary Committee.

In its issue of May 29, 1972, U.S. News & World Report presents this Soviet record. Consider some examples:

At Potsdam, where President Harry Truman represented the United States in a summit meeting after Germany's surrender, the Soviet Union made 14 major agreements. All were broken.

In 1955 at Geneva in a Big Four meeting, including France, Russia agreed that Germany's reunification problem should be settled by free elections. Moscow later refused to permit such elections.

In World War II, the Soviets promised Western allies they were seeking no territorial aggrandizement. But Russia by 1948 controlled 11 countries—plus East Germany—and 750 million people.

Some have argued that times have changed, that the Soviet Union in 1972 is more trustworthy than it has been in the past, that we are now entitled, if not obligated, to place faith in its word.

Yet, recent examples of Soviet violation of agreements are as numerous as those dating to the period of World War II.

In 1969, for example, the Soviet Union promised to end the nuclear arms race

and work toward disarmament. Instead, it accelerated its missile construction and overtook our own country. Now it is challenging us in almost every category of nuclear weaponry.

Even more recently, in 1970, the Soviet Union approved of a U.S. cease-fire plan in the Middle East, then helped Egypt violate it by moving SA-2 and SA-3 anti-aircraft missiles up to the Suez Canal.

Can the good faith of a country with a record such as this be taken seriously? Can we, in fact, stake our own national security upon it?

The record indicates that the burden of proof is clearly with those who say that we can. No one should make that decision until carefully reviewing the record.

Following is a brief summation of that record as it appeared in U.S. News & World Report:

SOVIET RECORD IN 25 SUMMIT AGREEMENTS—ONE HONORED, 24 BROKEN

In seven summit meetings between a U.S. President and a Soviet leader, 25 agreements have been reached. The Soviets have violated 24 of those 25 agreements, according to a staff study for the Senate Judiciary Committee. Here is their record:

1943. At Teheran, in a meeting with British Prime Minister Winston Churchill and U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Joseph Stalin made four major agreements. Russia broke all of them.

1945. At Yalta, in another wartime Big Three meeting, Russia entered into six major agreements, of which five were violated. The only pledge kept was to enter the war against Japan—and that was done only after the outcome was decided.

1945. At Potsdam, where President Harry Truman represented U.S. in a summit meeting after Germany's surrender, Stalin made 14 major agreements. All were broken.

1955. At Geneva, in a Big Four meeting including France, Russia agreed that Germany's reunification problem should be settled by free elections. Moscow later refused to permit such elections.

No hard agreements were reached at the last three summit meetings—in 1959 when President Dwight Eisenhower met with Nikita Khrushchev in Camp David, Md.; in 1961 when President John F. Kennedy met with Khrushchev in Vienna, and in 1967, when Premier Alexei Kosygin conferred with President Lyndon B. Johnson in Glassboro, N.J.

The Russians similarly have failed to keep many other international agreements with the U.S. Examples:

In World War II, the Soviets promised Western allies they were seeking no territorial aggrandizement. But Russia by 1948 controlled 11 countries—plus East Germany—and 750 million people.

Russia repeatedly promised the U.S. between 1942 and 1946 that it would guarantee freedom and free elections in Hungary, Bulgaria, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Rumania. All those countries wound up with Communist dictatorships.

The Kremlin pledged to repatriate World War II prisoners, but instead sent millions of them to slave-labor camps.

Russia gave the U.S. a promise that Korea would be free and independent—then set up a Communist government in the northern half of the country and masterminded an attempt to invade and conquer the rest of Korea. That broken promise cost the lives of 33,629 Americans.

The Soviet Foreign Minister traveled to New York in 1946 and repeated a previous Kremlin promise that the Danube River

would be opened to free navigation and trade. Today, the lower Danube, behind the Iron Curtain, is still a controlled Communist waterway.

The Soviet Union promised the U.S. that it would treaty Germany as one country after World War II—then sealed off its occupation zone, turned it into a separate country and is now seeking to make Germany's division permanent.

Russia's promise of free travel between Berlin and the West has been broken repeatedly. Outstanding examples of this were the Berlin blockade of 1948-1949 and the 1961 construction of the Berlin Wall.

Russia repeatedly assured the U.S. in 1962 that the arms build-up in Communist Cuba was purely defensive in character—then secretly put in offensive missiles aimed at the U.S. When this action was met by a firm U.S. challenge and naval blockade, Russia promised to remove the missiles.

Faced with Russia's long history of breaking agreements, the U.S. attempted a tacit rather than a formal agreement to halt nuclear testing in 1958. In 1961 the Soviets broke this understanding and resumed testing.

In signing a nonproliferation treaty in 1969, Russia promised to end the nuclear arms race and work toward disarmament. Instead, Russia accelerated its missile construction, overtook the U.S. and is now challenging in almost every category of nuclear weaponry.

In 1970 Russia approved of a U.S. cease-fire plan in the Middle East, then helped Egypt violate it by moving SA-2 and SA-3 antiaircraft missiles up to the Suez Canal.

Other countries, as well as the U.S., have learned by experience that they could not rely on agreements with the Kremlin. Examples:

In joining the League of Nations in 1934, Russia pledged not to resort to war. In 1939, Russia was expelled from the League for acts of aggression, including the invasion of Poland and Finland—both countries with which Moscow had signed treaties of non-aggression.

In violation of nonaggression pacts, Russia invaded Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania in 1940 and incorporated them into the Soviet Union.

AGRIBUSINESS BIAS SEEN IN UNIVERSITIES

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago, the agribusiness accountability project released a report entitled "Hard Tomatoes, Hard Times."

The report delves deeply into the expenditure of tax funds at America's land-grant colleges, and concludes that—

The tax paid, land grant complex has come to serve an elite of private, corporate interests in rural America, while ignoring those who have the most urgent needs and the most legitimate claims for assistance.

Most disturbing in their report is the degree to which "people-oriented" needs—such as rural poverty, rural income improvement and rural housing—are ignored in terms of total research by these colleges.

In 1969, for example, 6,000 man-years of research was conducted by our land-

grant colleges, yet only 4.8 percent deal with people-oriented programs. Eighteen scientific man-years were spent on improving rural income, and seven on rural housing. A grand total of 17 scientific man-years was spent on the causes and remedies of poverty among rural people, while enormous amounts of time and money were spent on the technical and managerial needs of agribusiness corporations and large-scale operators.

Mr. Speaker, these are not the only disturbing facts brought out by "Hard Tomatoes, Hard Times." Certainly they are sufficient to make this must reading for all those concerned about the future of our rural areas, because if we speak of agricultural or rural development without zeroing in on the problems facing rural people, then we are blindfolding ourselves against the true problems of rural America.

The following article from the Washington Post regarding this report indicates some of its other conclusions and recommendations:

AGRIBUSINESS BIAS SEEN IN UNIVERSITIES

(By Nick Kotz)

The nation's tax-supported land grant universities have served corporate agribusiness while neglecting the needs of consumers, family farmers, farm workers, and rural America, a report charged yesterday.

The land grant college complex—composed of colleges of agriculture, agriculture experiment stations and state extension services—are charged with spending annually almost \$1 billion in tax dollars "almost solely for efforts that have worked to the advantage and profit of large corporations involved in agriculture."

The 308-page critical study was made by the Agribusiness Accountability Project, a nonprofit, research organization, financed principally by the Field Foundation, and interested in the problems of the rural poor.

Jim Hightower, the project director, said at a press conference that his group soon will file lawsuits against various land grant universities, to require them to stop serving special corporate interests at the expense of the public interest.

The report, entitled "Hard Tomatoes, Hard Times, The Failure of the Land Grant College Complex" variously asserts that:

The land grant college complex has stimulated an agricultural scientific revolution which changed the face of rural America without devoting any attention to the needs of farmers, farm workers, consumers, and rural communities that have been adversely affected by that change. Even though the revolution in agriculture has enormously increased production, the gains in "strict economic efficiency" have been often offset by harm to "people."

Of 6,000 scientific man-years of research conducted at government-financed agricultural research stations in 1969, only 289 hours were devoted to the needs of rural people and their communities.

University research in cooperation with food corporations often has produced less desirable food for consumers such as "hard tomatoes," which were developed to withstand machine picking, or has produced harmful foods, such as cattle fattened with possible disease-producing chemicals.

Corporate agribusiness has developed machinery with taxpayers' help, "but the workers who are replaced are not even entitled to unemployment compensation."

The important advisory committees appointed by the Agriculture Department to supervise research have seldom had repre-

sentation from "the rural nonfarmer, the small farmer, the leaders of rural communities, and the consumer."

Land grant colleges and their officials are guilty of numerous conflicts of interest in their relationships with agribusiness corporation. "It is difficult to find the public interest," the report states, in relationships in which it is impossible to tell "where the corporation ends and the land grant college begins."

The Agriculture Department's extension service has helped market agribusiness products while failing to implement a 1955 law relating to special needs of rural people and communities.

Black land grant colleges, created by an 1890 law in 16 southern and border states, are discriminated against in receiving less than one per cent of USDA funds allocated to land grants and agricultural research in those states.

Land grant colleges are not required to make adequate public accounting of their activities, particularly those conducted in partnership with agribusiness corporations.

"Had the land grant community chosen to put its time, its money, its expertise, and its technology into the family farm rather than into corporate pockets," the report states, "then rural America today would be a place where millions could live and work in dignity. The colleges have mistaken corporate need for national need. This is proving to be a fatal mistake for the people of America. It is time to reorient the colleges to act in the public interest."

The study recommends:

A General Accounting Office audit of the land grant complex.

Reopening of congressional hearings on the 1972-73 agricultural research budget.

Legislation prohibiting land grant personnel from receiving remuneration from agribusiness corporations in specified "conflicts of interest;" prohibiting corporations from earmarking research contributions for work in their own behalf; ensuring that land-grant patenting practices do not allow private gain from public expenditure.

"The land grant colleges must get out of the corporate board rooms," the report concluded. "They must get the corporate interests out of their labs. They must draw back and reassess their preoccupation with mechanical, genetical and chemical gadgetry. The complex must again become the people's university. It must be redirected to focus the preponderance of its resources on the full development of the rural potential."

The activities of Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz and his predecessor Clifford Hardin were cited in the report as an example of the close ties between agribusiness and the land grant colleges.

Butz and Hardin, to a certain extent, exchanged places as Hardin took the position being vacated by Butz on the board of directors of the Ralston Purina Co.

The report noted that Butz served as an officer of the Purdue Research Foundation and Purdue University, and as a \$10,000-a-year director of the International Minerals and Chemical Corporation at the same time that the corporation gave the university research funds, developed a product through university research, and received a patent on the product from the university research foundation.

At the same time Butz and his university had interrelated ties with IMC and other companies, the report says Butz was publicly advocating industry viewpoints with such statements as: "Caution must be exercised that we don't go overboard in our hysteria to clean up the environment and make everything absolutely safe."

In contending that many land grant research facilities "begin to look like labo-

ratories for the chemical industry," the report cites a University of California professor who said that at his school, a recipient of \$600,000 in funds from chemical companies in three years, "individuals are more loyal to the insecticide companies than to the university or the growers."

Among questionable development of chemicals by universities to serve commercial food interests, the report cited:

The use of ethrel at Louisiana State University to effect ripening of hot pepper; the use of ferric ammonia citrate and erythorbic acid at Texas A&M to loosen fruit before machine harvesting; the development by the University of Florida of "thick-skinned" tomatoes which are then ripened in storage by application of ethylene gas.

In addition to developing products of questionable safety and edibility, the report contends that universities have helped agribusiness develop products to deceive consumers.

For example, the report cited Iowa State University studies which indicate bacon stays bright-colored longer when it is vacuum sealed on carbon dioxide and University of South Carolina studies using a fluorescent light treatment to increase the red color in green-picked tomatoes.

IN THE WAKE OF SUMMIT, HOPES MUST BE CAUTIOUS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Nashville Tennessean in a recent editorial pointed out that although a beginning toward disarmament has been achieved at the recent summit conference in Moscow:

It will take much more labor to erect a firm foundation for a stable world... cautious optimism is in order.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in the President's efforts to achieve disarmament, I place the editorial in the RECORD herewith.

The editorial follows:

[From the Nashville Tennessean, May 31, 1972]

IN THE WAKE OF SUMMIT, HOPES MUST BE CAUTIOUS

The Moscow summit is over, climaxed by the joint signing of a declaration of principles in which the United States and the Soviet Union pledged to seek peaceful solutions to their disputes. After two and a half decades, a watershed has been reached.

The meeting between the leaders of the two countries culminated in accords on limiting offensive and defensive weapons, on cooperation in space, on preventing Navy collisions at sea, on joining to fight pollution and cooperating in fields of health.

All of these are significant and even historic, but the millennial epoch is not yet at hand and the Russian bear has not changed into docility. Nobody knows at this point whether the arms limitation accords are going to be in good faith, or if a joint operation in space will work out.

What may be fully as important as any of these and, in fact, the determinant factor, are the personal contacts between the leaders of the two nations and their joint pledge to continue negotiating on a wide range of is-

suces, including mutual and balanced force reductions in Central Europe.

But even with the agreements both sides reached, and the spirit of harmony that seemed to prevail between Mr. Nixon and the Kremlin leaders, there still remain deep divisions over Vietnam and the Middle East.

And Communist doctrine has not changed. Marxism-Leninism is a combative ideology. It progresses through struggle, although there are frequent pauses to re-group. But even so, the prospect of nuclear war and mass destruction introduces another factor in Communist dogma.

The Kremlin has a vested interest in avoiding holocaust, although the struggle may take other forms. The key to the Moscow summit very well may have been President Nixon's trip to Communist China and the emergence of communication between Washington and Peking.

The Sino-Soviet conflict is very real and what the Kremlin least wants is a closer rapprochement between Washington and Peking. If it had withdrawn its bid for Mr. Nixon's visit, that possibility would have loomed large.

There are intractable problems among the big powers; the fears of the Chinese that Russia may one day turn on them, and somewhat similar fears among Russians that the Chinese leadership may strike out in anger.

The struggles for primacy and influence in the world will continue, but President Nixon has sought, both in Peking and Moscow, to create a climate in which the voices of moderation are given freer rein than the voices of militancy; that restraint holds in the face of temptation.

Some building blocks have been erected, but the balance is yet fragile and uncertain. It will take much more labor to erect a firm foundation for a stable world. At this point, cautious optimism is in order—with the emphasis on caution.

A RESPONSIVE CONGRESS

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, there is a great movement in our country to make the Congress more "responsive" to the people. This is a great cause and one which most, and perhaps all, Members of Congress staunchly support. The large number of questionnaires, newsletters, radio and television reports, correspondence, and public appearances, both in nonelection and election years, represent a great effort on behalf of the Members to inform their constituents and to be informed on the views of those whom they represent.

Those who have stood for elective office would testify that there is no greater training in the science of being "responsive" than to place your name on a ballot where people can vote for or against you. Teaching responsiveness without standing for elective office is like teaching swimming without using water.

As the lobbyists study Congress, I am certain they would recognize the fairness in a congressional examination of lobbyists.

The biggest spending lobby in the last quarter of 1971 was Common Cause, spending a reported \$123,000 in 3 months.

For purposes of comparison, the Disabled American Veterans lobby listed \$32,759 during the last quarter of 1971. Common Cause's total spending for the year was \$1.1 million. Their 1972 operating budget is \$2,294,300.

The Associated Press lists Common Cause as a "self-styled people's lobby." How is a "people's lobby" organized? How is it made truly "responsive?" Well, in the first place, it is not done by selecting its governing board through democratic processes. The present governing board for Common Cause—from whom you are receiving advices on how to be more "responsive" on Vietnam, water pollution, welfare reform, et cetera, presently consists of 42 members. Of these, 22—a majority—are appointed, not elected. Of these 42, 15 come from the area of Washington, D.C., with 11 listing the District of Columbia as their address and the other four from the Washington metropolitan area. Seven are from New York State, and all those seven are from the New York City metropolitan area. Three members are from Chicago, two from Los Angeles, two from Phoenix, Ariz., and one each from San Francisco, San Diego, and Stanford, Calif., St. Paul, Minn.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Lincoln, Mass.; Detroit, Mich.; Muscatine, Iowa; Cincinnati, Ohio; Durham, N.C.; New Haven, Conn.; Ann Arbor, Mich.; and Bennington, Vt.

Therefore, "representatives" faces a considerable hurdle at the outset, since 37 of the 50 States of our Nation have no representatives on the Common Cause Board. Among the unrepresented are 4½ million of my fellow Missourians.

I expect every Member of the House of Representatives would agree that the House is not as responsive to the people as it should be. However, it would appear nonetheless that some people's lobbies are probably less responsive, and certainly less representative than the U.S. Congress.

By 1974, Common Cause proposes a Board of 80 members—60 of whom would be directly elected by the membership and 20 of whom would be elected by the board itself. What would the public reaction be if we proposed a Congress of 400 Members—300 elected directly by the people and the other 100 selected by Congressmen themselves, "to insure that all segments of the population and all geographic areas are represented?"

Being a Congressman from the "Show Me" State can be exhilarating, exciting, frustrating, fractious, or just plain puzzling. However, it is never boring and carries the constant comfort that no matter how strongly your constituents may agree or disagree with you, they insist on thinking for themselves. The praise or vituperation you read does not represent the canned thoughts of a Washington-New York-Los Angeles or New Haven lobbyist, no matter how well paid those opinion molders may be.

I would urge voters, concerned about the problems and policies facing our country, to buy an 8-cent stamp and write your own letter to your Congressman. It is cheaper than joining Common Cause—and more effective.